SUPREME COURT, U. S.

APR 4 1968

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

No. 1291

STATE OF LOUISIANA
(Plaintiff)

versus

JOHN T. HOPPER and JOE A. WOODARD
(Defendants-Petitioners)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

CAMILLE F. GRAVEL, JR.,
611 Murray Street,
Alexandria, Louisiana 71301,
Attorney for Defendants-Petitioners.

HAUSER PRINTING CO., INC., "Legal Printers", 441 GRAVIER ST., NEW ORLEANS, LA.



INDEX

		PAGE
OPINIONS BELOW		1
JURISDICTION		2
THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED		
Part I	Prosecutor's Conduct	2
Part II	Severance	3
Part III	Unreasonable and Unconsented Interception of Conversation	3
Part IV	Confessions	4
Part V	Cumulative Errors	5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED		5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE		
Part I	Prosecutor's Conduct	8
Part II	Severance	12
Part III	Unreasonable and Unconsented Interception of Conversation	13
Part IV	Confessions	14
Part V	Cumulative Errors	25
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT		
Part I	Prosecutor's Conduct	28
Part II	Severance	43
Part III	Unreasonable and Unconsented Interception of Conversation	52
Part IV	Confessions	59
Part V	Cumulative Errors	81

INDEX—(Continued)

PAGE

APPENDIX A

Opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana A-1

APPENDIX B

Judgment of Twelfth Judicial District Court Imposing Sentence B-1

APPENDIX C

Order Extending Time in Which to Apply for Writ of Certiorari C-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutions

Fourth Amendment to the Const. of U. S. 4, 5, 57, 58, 59, 71

Fifth Amendment to the Const. of U. S. 4, 5, 56, 57, 59, 70, 71, 81

Sixth Amendment to the Const. of U. S. 4, 6, 46, 47, 48, 56, 58, 59, 71, 81

Fourteenth Amendment to the Const. of U. S. 4, 5, 6, 32, 35, 47, 48, 68, 71, 75, 82

Louisiana Statutes

R.S. 15:58 60

R.S. 15:59, 60, 66, 67, 70, 77, 78 59

R.S. 15:77 (now repealed) 6, 61, 64

R.S. 15:316 (now repealed) 8, 43

R.S. 15:450 53

West's Louisiana Statutes Annotated, Code of Criminal Procedure, Reporter's Comment, Vol. 2, page 283 44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—(Continued)

Cases	PAGE
Adams v. States, 20 So. 2d 593 (Miss.)	38, 39
Aquillar v. Texas, 84 S. Ct. 1509	60
Alcorta v. State of Texas, 355 U.S. 28, — S. Ct. 103, 2 L. Ed. 2d 9	34
Almeida v. Baldi, 3 Cir. 195 F. 2d 815, 33 A.L.R. 2d 1407	34
Ashley v. Texas, 310 F. 2d 80, 83	33, 34
Barbee v. Warden, 4 Cir., 331 F. 2d 842	34
Berry v. Bass, 102 So. 76	60
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 87	32
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1, 3, 86 S. Ct. 1245, 1246, 16 L. Ed. 2d 314	46, 47
Butler v. State, 97 N.E. 242	36, 42
Campbell v. State, 384 S.W. 2d 4 (1964)	69
Carnley v. Cochran, 82 S. Ct. 884	68, 71
Cohens v. Commonwealth of Virginia, 6 Wheat. 264, 387, 5 L. Ed. 257 (1821)	76
Columbe v. Connecticut, 367 U.S. 503, 83 S. Ct. 1960 (1961)	66, 68, 91
Commonwealth v. McCarthy, 200 N.E. 2d 264 (1964)	69
Crooker v. California, 78 S. Ct. 1287	71
Delli Paoli vs. United States, 352 U.S. 232 (1957)	51, 52
Duncan v. State of Mississippi, 176 So. 2d 840	61
Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478 (1964)	4, 5, 56, 57, 68, 69, 76, 77, 79, 80
Fahy v. Connecticut, 845 S. Ct. 229, 84 S. Ct. 229	2, 91
Fikes v. Alabama, 352 U.S. 191, 77 S. Ct. 281 (1957)	91
Giles v. Maryland, 386 U.S. 75, 87 S. Ct. 793 (1967)	34
Haley v. Ohio, 68 S. Ct. 302	73
Hamilton v. Alabama, 82 S. Ct. 157	68
Haynes v. Washington, 373 U.S. 503, 83 S. Ct. 1336 (1963)	64, 68, 72, 73, 74, 81, 91
Henry v. United States, 80 S. Ct. 168	60
Hundley v. Millner, 114 F. Supp. 206	60
Jackson v. Denno, 378 U.S. 368	49, 52
Ex parte Jackson, 96 U.S. 727, 733, 24 L. Ed. 877	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—(Continued)

Cases—(Continued) PAGE

Johnson v. New Jersey, 384 U.S. 719, 86 S. Ct. 1772 ..... 4, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81
Jenkins v. State, 136 So. 2d 580 (Miss.) 38, 39

Kanner v. United States, 34 F. 2d 863 89
Katz v. United States, 88 S. Ct. 507 (1967) 4, 58
Kerr v. California, 83 S. Ct. 1623 61

Lewis v. United States, 385 U.S. 206, 210, 87 S. Ct. 424, 427, 17 L. Ed. 2d 312 58
Leyra v. Denno, 75 S. Ct. 716 ..... 68, 74
Louisiana v. Edward Hughes, 29 La. Ann. 514 54
Lynumm v. Illinois, 83 S. Ct. 917 ..... 66, 68, 74

Macon v. Commonwealth, 46 S.E. 2d 396 ..... 36, 37
Mallory v. United States, 77 S. Ct. 1356 ..... 61, 62, 63, 64
Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 ..... 62, 63
Massiah v. United States, 377 U.S. 207, 84 S. Ct. 1199 (1964) 4, 56, 57, 59
McNabb v. United States, 318 U.S. 332 ..... 63, 64
Miller v. Pate, 386 U.S. 1, 87 S. Ct. 785, 17 L. Ed. 2d 690 34
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602 (1966) 4, 5, 56, 57, 70, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81
Mooney v. Holohan, 294 U.S. 103, 55 S. Ct. 340, 79 L. Ed. 791 34
Morton v. United States, 147 F. 2d 28 60
Mound v. State, 48 So. 2d 553 36

Napue v. People of State of Illinois, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S. Ct. 1173, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1217 ..... 32, 34
Nicely, et al, 130 PA. 261, 18 A. 737 39

Payne v. Arkansas, 78 S. Ct. 844 ..... 73, 74
People v. Dorado, 394 P. 2d 952 ..... 68, 69
People v. Waterman, 9 N.Y. 2d 561, 216 N.Y. S.2d 70, 75, 175 N.E. 2d 445, 448 57
Pigg v. United States, 337 F. 2d 302 61
Pointer v. State of Texas, 380 U.S. 400, 403, 404, 85 S. Ct. 1065, 1068, 13 L. Ed. 2d 923 ..... 45, 46, 47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—(Continued)

Cases—(Continued) PAGE

Pyle v. State of Kansas, 317 U.S. 213, 63 S. Ct. 177, 87 L. Ed. 214 34
Reck v. Pate, 367 U.S. 433, 81 S. Ct. 1541 (1961) 73, 74, 81
Rhodes v. Jordan, 151 So. 811 60
Rios v. United States, 364 U.S. 253, 80 S. Ct. 1431, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1688 58
Robinson v. United States, 32 F. 2d 505 ..... 36, 40
Rogers v. Richmond, 365 U.S. 534 68
Royes v. First National Bank, 183 Wis. P. 21, 197 N.W. 237 42
Russo v. New Jersey, 351 F. 2d 429 (3rd Cir. 1965) 69
Smith v. State of Illinois, 88 S. Ct. 748 (1968) 47, 48
Spano v. New York, 360 U.S. 315, 79 S. Ct. 1202 (1959) 68, 73, 74, 81
State v. Birgiglia, 149 La. 4, 88 So. 533 (1924) 45
State v. Brazile, 75 So. 2d 856 (La.) 45
State v. Calcione, 149 So. 2d 417 61
State v. Carter, 248 La. 730, 181 So. 2d 763 80
State v. Christian, 30 La. Ann. 567 88
State v. Cook, 215 La. 163, 39 So. 2d 898 at 900 (1949) 44, 45
State v. Davidson, 177 So. 2d 273 63
State v. Davis, 164 So. 2d 589 ..... 36, 37
State v. Dufour, 206 A.2d 82 (1965) 69
State v. Furtrell, 106 So. 651 87
State v. Faciane, 233 La. 1028, 99 So. 2d 333 45
State v. Goury, 184 La. 955, 168 So. 113 (1936) 45
State v. Hall, 397 P. 2d 261 (1964) 69
State v. Hughes, 29 La. Ann. 514 54
State v. Johnson, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 137 80
State v. Lamotte, 168 La. 837, 123 So. 591 (1929) 45
State v. Layton, 158 La. 375 88
State v. Livesey, 190 La. 474, 182 So. 576 (1938) 45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—(Continued)

Cases—(Continued) PAGE

State v. Mack, 243 La. 369, 144 So. 2d 363, cert. denied, 873 U.S. 917 — 45
State v. Marchetti, 173 So. 2d 531 — 62
State v. Morgan, 30 So. 2d 434 — 84, 85
State v. Morris, 157 So. 2d 728 — 85, 87
State v. Neely, 395 P. 2d 557 (1964) — 69
State v. Osborn, 54 Or. 289, 103 P. 62, 20 Ann. Cas. 627 — 39
State v. Pepper, 180 So. 642 — 89
State v. Progue, 243 La. 337, 144 So. 2d 352 — 45
State of Louisiana v. Rideau, 83 S. Ct. 1417 — 74
Thompson v. Dye, 3 Cir., 221 F. 2d 763 — 34
Turner v. State, 55 So. 2d 228 — 36, 38
United States v. Buono, 247 F. 2d 838, (2nd Cir. 1957) — 36, 41
United States v. Festa, 192 F. Supp. 160 — 60
United States v. Lee, 274 U.S. 559, 563, 47 S. Ct. 746, 748, 71 L. Ed. 1202 — 58
United States v. Rincke, 229 F. Supp. 132 — 61
Watts v. Indiana, 338 U.S. 49 — 68
White v. Maryland, 83 S. Ct. 1050 — 68
Wong Sun v. United States, 83 S. Ct. 407 — 62, 64
Ziegler v. State, 203 N.W. 872 (Wisconsin, 1926) — 36, 41

Miscellaneous Others

4 Louisiana Law Review 622 — 88
18 Louisiana Law Review 139 — 84
24 Louisiana Law Review 340 — 62
25 Louisiana Law Review 162 — 87
28 U.S. Code, Sec. 1257 (3) — 2
14 American Jurisprudence, "Criminal Law", Sec. 196 — 89, 90
14 American Jurisprudence, "Criminal Law," Sec. 200 at Page 907 — 89

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—(Continued)

Miscellaneous Others—(Continued)	PAGE
42 American Jurisprudence Sec. 20, Page 255	39
23 C. J. S., Sec. 851 (1) p. 352	84
Sec. 5, Art. XIV, Articles of Incorporation, La. State Bar Assn. printed at West's La. R.S. Vol. 21A (Title 37), page 165, 1964 ed.	34
Vol. 24, No. 19, U.S. Law Week (34 L. W. 2261 "Criminal Law and Procedure")	49
The Supreme Court, 1963 Term, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 179, 213 (1964)	52

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

No.

STATE OF LOUISIANA
(Plaintiff)

versus

JOHN T. HOPPER and JOE A. WOODARD
(Defendants-Petitioners)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard, your petitioners, pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment and decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana which affirmed a conviction of your petitioners of the offense of manslaughter in the Twelfth Judicial District Court, Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana.

OPINIONS BELOW

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA. The opinion of the Louisiana Supreme Court bears the style and citation as follows: State of Louisiana v. Hopper and Woodard, 251

La. 77, 203 So. 2d 222 (1967). A copy of the opinion is appended to this petition and made part hereof. (See Appendix A).

TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, AVOYELLES PARISH, LOUISIANA. The trial judge did not write or render a general or comprehensive opinion although he did write per curiae to several of the Bills of Exception. The reasons assigned by the trial judge are interdispersed among the many pages which comprise the voluminous record of this case. The minutes showing the judgment imposing sentence is appended to this petition and made part hereof. (See Appendix B).

JURISDICTION

The judgment and opinion of the Court below (See Appendix A) was entered on June 5, 1967. Rehearing was denied on November 6, 1967. Upon timely motion, the Honorable Hugo L. Black, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, on January 27, 1968, signed and issued an Order Extending Time To File Petition For Writ Of Certiorari to and including April 4, 1968. (See Appendix C).

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under the provisions of 28 U.S. Code Sec. 1257 (3).

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Part I. Prosecutor's Conduct

A. Whether the prosecutor's constitutional duty to disclose extends to all evidence admissible and useful to the defense, and the degree of prejudice which must be shown to make necessary a new trial.

B. Whether conduct of the prosecutor denies petition-

ers due process when the prosecution is guilty of the following misconduct:

(1) the suppression of evidence tending to destroy the credibility of a major state witness, and arguing to the jury in a manner calculated to give credence to that witness on a point known by the prosecution to be false.

(2) displaying to the jury clothing of defendant which had been excluded.

(3) arguing to the jury about certain excluded evidence after the Court had sustained objection by the defense.

(4) telling the jury that the prosecution had evidence (photographs) which the jury had not seen.

(5) refusal of prosecutor to testify at motion to suppress relative to his knowledge — but acting as both prosecutor and witness at jury trial.

Part II. Severance

Whether denial of a request for severance of two defendants, each of whom made incriminating statements particularly implicating the other, violates their right to cross-examination of a witness who in effect is testifying against them, and secondly, whether instruction by the judge to the jury can adequately protect the accused's right to due process and a fair trial in light of the fact that the jury cannot effectively remove from their minds the part of the confession which implicates the co-defendant.

Part III. Unreasonable and Unconsented Interception of Conversation

Petitioner Woodard while imprisoned, prior to obtaining counsel, (the State contends), had a conversation, which

(if he had it at all) he intended to remain private. A state witness, Rev. John D. Bell, claiming to be in the jail for other reasons, testified that he overheard a portion of a statement importing culpability of Woodard.

The question presented is whether the admission of a fragment of an allegedly incriminating statement (not even necessarily a whole sentence) under these circumstances (1) constitutes a denial of due process, (2) a violation of the defendants' Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination and Sixth Amendment right to counsel under the *Massiah* case, or (3) violates the Fourth Amendment rights of the accused against unreasonable and unconsented searches and constitutes an unlawful invasion of his privacy under *Katz v. United States*, 88 S. Ct. 507 (1967).

Part IV. Confessions

A. Whether a confession can be held to be free and voluntary and otherwise admissible into evidence when it is obtained from a suspect who at the time is under the influence of intoxicants, in need of medical treatment, not informed that he is to be charged with a capital offense, and who has not been taken forthwith to a committing magistrate in accordance with state law, and further who has not been fully and adequately warned of his constitutional rights against self-incrimination and to counsel?

B. Whether the Court should limit *Johnson v. New Jersey* to its own facts—a pre—*Escobedo* or *Miranda* FINAL judgment attacked in COLLATERAL proceedings, and permit petitioners under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to raise on direct appeal either directly or as part of an involuntariness claim the same Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights pro-

tected in *Escobedo* and *Miranda* which petitioners raised at the time of trial?

Part V. Cumulative Error

Whether the totality of circumstances indicated collectively as set out in Parts I, II, III, and IV of this petition along with other errors committed in the trial of petitioners, including, but not limited to, admission of gruesome autopsy color slides of the deceased when petitioners had offered to stipulate to the cause of the death and the permitting of the jury to take evidence (by viewing the cell in which the petitioners had been confined) outside of the presence of petitioners, constitutes cumulative error of such a magnitude as to deprive the petitioners of their fundamental right to a fair and impartial trial under the due process of law clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Fourth Amendment, United States Constitution.

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Fifth Amendment, United States Constitution.

> No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb;

nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Sixth Amendment, United States Constitution.

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining Witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Fourteenth Amendment, Section One, United States Constitution.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

West's Louisiana Revised Statutes, Title 15, Section 77 (now repealed).

Every peace officer making an arrest or who shall have turned over to him any person arrested by a private person and any person making an arrest of another person shall immediately conduct the person arrested to the nearest jail or police station and then and there cause him to be booked, that is to say,

shall cause to be entered on the book to be kept for that purpose the name of the prisoner and the crime or violation of ordinance charged against him and for which he shall have been arrested. Said book shall always be kept open for the inspection of the public, and the officer in charge shall furnish without cost a certified copy of the entry thereon to any person desiring such copy.

All persons arrested shall, from the moment of their arrest, be entitled to confer with counsel, and shall not be placed in solitary confinement in any jail or precinct station, and denied the right to confer with counsel. They shall be given the right and privilege of using the telephone in the jail or station or send a messenger for the purpose of communicating with counsel and with his friends and relatives for the purpose of securing counsel. They shall also have the right and privilege of using the telephone in the jail or station or send a messenger for the purpose of communication with any person, firm or corporation in order to secure their release by bail or parole and such person, firm or corporation when contacted or communicated with shall have the right to visit said arrested person within a reasonable time, if not charged with a crime in which no release or bail is allowed by law.

No peace officer or other person making an arrest shall neglect, fail, or refuse to immediately conduct the person arrested to the nearest jail or police precinct station and immediately cause him to be booked. Such neglect or refusal shall be prima facie evidence and proof of violation of this Section.

Whoever violates this Section shall be fined not less than fifty dollars nor more than five hundred dollars, or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

This Section shall not be construed as in any wise intended to deprive or divest the superintendent of

police of the city of New Orleans of the right to release upon his own responsibility any prisoner, at any time previous to his actual arraignment in open court. As amended Acts 1950, No. 386, § 1.

West's Louisiana Revised Statutes, Title 15, Section 316 (now repealed).

Person jointly indicted shall be jointly tried, unless the district attorney elect to place such persons separately upon trial, or unless the court, upon motion of defendant, shall, after a hearing contradictorily with the district attorney, order a severance.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Part I. Prosecutor's Conduct

At the trial before the jury, Reverend John D. Bell testified that he had visited the Avoyelles Parish Jail on the morning of April 20, 1964 (the day after the arrest of petitioners) and that he heard a conversation between one of the petitioners and an unidentified person. He testified that petitioner said, "I wish to hell I had had time to stomp some more to death". The witness testified that he saw the defendant Woodard who allegedly made the statement and identified him in court. From the testimony of the Sheriff, the Chief Deputy Sheriff, Captain Normand, and the Jailer, it was established that the petitioners were confined in a maximum security cell and would not have been visible to Reverend Bell and thus he could not have identified the speaking party. During the course of the prosecutor's argument to the jury he made the following statement:

"And this security, Gentlemen of the Jury, this security in the jail—that's too big a joke to even discuss. I want to ask you this—you all looked in that jail cell—and I don't like to mention that with

ladies present, and this large crowd in the courtroom, **but did you all see a toilet in there?** These men had to go to the toilet from the time that they got in there Sunday morning until sometime Monday morning—I feel certain. You don't think they'd let them out."

As shown by the testimony as well as the stipulation taken at the motion for a new trial, the prosecution knew and had been informed that on April 19th, 20th, and 21st and at all times up until a short time prior to the trial of this case, there was, in fact, a toilet in the cell occupied by the defendants on April 19th, 20th, and 21st, 1964. Counsel for defendants did not learn, until after verdict, of the facts as they actually existed on April 19th, 20th and 21st, in 1964.

During the course of the trial before the jury, after the court had sustained a defense objection, the prosecutor persisted in making statements relative to possible perjury by a witness in his testimony before the grand jury. Similarly, after a physical exhibit—clothes of one of the defendants—had been excluded, the prosecutor in the guise of questioning a witness displayed the clothes in the presence of the jury.

During the prosecutor's argument to the jury the intentional inference was given that evidence was being withheld from the jury by the following remarks of the prosecutor:

"I will agree with one thing—one that that was said—I will agree with this. A picture is worth ten thousand words. **I had a lot of pictures and you all couldn't see them.**"

BY MR. GRAVEL:

"That's objected to if the Court please—"

BY THE COURT:

"What was that statement, Mr. Roy?"

BY MR. ROY:

"I said I had a lot of pictures they couldn't see".

BY MR. GRAVEL:

"That's objected to if the Court please as being improper and prejudicial to the defense, and I again move for a mistrial."
(See Record, p. 3809)

At another point the prosecutor said:

"The first witness that we called if you remember was Mr. Richard Couvillion. He's a former teacher here at Marksville who taught Vocational Education, and he had made a little model that cost me a hundred dollars that I thought (Interrupted)"

BY MR. GRAVEL:

"Just a minute, Mr. Roy, I'm going to object to the District Attorney talking about a model that's not in evidence. It was withdrawn by the State."

BY THE COURT:

"I will sustain the objection."

BY MR. ROY: (CONT'd)

"Well, I tried to introduce something, you all know what it was, but like everything else . . ."

BY MR. GRAVEL:

"Just a moment—I object to that, Your Honor. Objection number one is the District Attorney saying that he tried to introduce, and what it was. That is not evidence. Now if Your Honor please I object to that, I ask the Judge to tell the Jury to disregard it, and I think that the State should also be instructed to only talk about the evidence that's in this case. Not about

anything that was withdrawn by them or that was not admitted in evidence."

BY THE COURT:

"That's true, gentlemen. You are to disregard the statement. Only the evidence that is admitted in the case is to be considered by you. The statement here about the exhibit that he withdrew from the evidence is not to be given any consideration whatsoever." (See Record, p. 3748-3749).

At another point the prosecutor said:

". . . we had pictures, and they didn't show any rocks, and it was objected to when we tried to get them to you." (See Record 3809)

Prior to the trial of petitioners on the merits, a pretrial motion to suppress evidence was filed and during the course of the hearing on it the defense called the prosecutor to the stand as a witness. Counsel for the defendant asked the District Attorney the following question:

"And in that connection as District Attorney was there brought to your attention on April 19th, 1964 (the day the instant crime is alleged to have been committed) any information regarding an occurrence out at the Pelican Club here in Marksville that resulted in the death of the young Beason Boy?"

After responding affirmatively to this question, the District Attorney was asked at what time the information was brought to his attention. He then said:

"First of all I wish that this tragedy had never occurred.

"Secondly, that I have a job to perform here and this is an adverse proceeding and I don't feel that counsel for the defense has a right to cross-examine me, there is no such procedure, as District Attorney

> and I feel that there will be a time in this case when I will perhaps have to take the stand and until such time I would—at that time I would be subject to cross-examination. Until that time does arrive, I object to being questioned as to what occurred or any of my notes or information that I may possess as District Attorney because in effect the District Attorney is the State's (inaudible) in any criminal case. For those reasons I object to being called under cross-examination at this time."

The District Attorney's objection was sustained by the judge and although the testimony of another witness alleged that the District Attorney at least partly advised the defendants on some aspects of their rights prior to one of their statements, the defense was not permitted to elicit from the District Attorney just what he advised the petitioners. Thereafter, during the course of the trial before the jury, the District Attorney both prosecuted the case and testified before the jury, taking the witness stand several times, over the objection of the defense.

Part II. Severance

Defendants, John T. Hopper and Joe E. Woodard, were jointly indicted for murder of Joseph Ralph Beeson. Prior to trial, the State in response to motions by defendants, indicated it had and intended to use in evidence certain oral incriminating statements or confessions by each of the defendants. Some of the purported confessions had been reduced to writing but were unsigned by either defendant. Other of the purported statements or confessions had not been reduced to writing and were oral. The State voluntarily in response to motions gave a copy of the unsigned statement or confession made by each defendant to counsel for defendants. Each of these statements (reduced to writing but unsigned) implicated the co-defendant as

well as the defendant making the statement. After a motion filed to suppress these incriminating statements and confessions was denied, each defendant filed a separate motion for severance alleging as grounds that the other defendant had made an incriminating statement or confession which also implicated the mover. The motions for severance were denied, and after a joint trial in which neither defendant testified, both defendants were convicted of manslaughter. In addition to the confessions reduced to writing other statements of each defendant implicating the other were admitted in the course of the trial, including a conversation allegedly overheard by a witness while the defendants were incarcerated.

Part III. Unreasonable and Unconsented Interception of Conversation

Petitioners were arrested on April 19, 1968, and after interrogation, without the benefit of consultation with counsel, they were incarcerated in the parish jail. The Bills now under discussion were taken in connection with the testimony of a Reverend John D. Bell. Reverend Bell claims to have been a Minister of a Marksville church at the time of the alleged crime. He testified that on Monday morning (the day following the arrest of the accused and while they were incarcerated in the Avoyelles Parish Jail) he went to the Jail for the purpose of ministering to those who needed spiritual help. He further testified that he saw the two accused and a third person, whom he could not identify, in the same jail cell; that he was about 6 or 8 feet from the cell where the three persons were; that he was standing in the hallway portion where he could be seen from the cell; that he did not know who the third person in the cell with the accused was; that he could not see which ones were doing the talking nor which ones were responding, etc.; that he stood there about 3 or 4 minutes;

that **he heard one of them whom he identified on the trial as Defendant Woodard,** say "I wish the hell I had time to stomp some more to death"; that he did not know what had led up to that particular statement; that he did not hear anything that anybody (of the three) said **before** the quoted statement nor did he hear anything **after** the quoted statement was made; that **the quoted statement was all that he heard.** The District Attorney then stated to the Court that he submitted and offered that the State had established a proper predicate and foundation to have the testimony of Reverend Bell admitted into the record and before the Jury and would like to offer his testimony in support of that predicate at this time. Counsel for defendants objected to the offering and submission made to the Court, urging the same objections and offerings and attachments made to prior submission on the ground that the proper foundation had not been laid. The Court overruled the objection and Bill No. 46 was reserved.

In the presence of the Jury the District Attorney elicited from Reverend Bell the same testimony after the defendants had made the same objections and the Court had made as related in connection with Bill of Exception No. 46.

There is some variation in the testimony of Reverend Bell outside the presence of the Jury and in the presence of the Jury. His testimony in the presence of the Jury was that he had never previously on any occasion spoken to either of the two defendants. He further testified that he had overheard defendant Woodard say "I wish to hell I had time to stomp another one to death".

Part IV. Confessions

In response to an application for Bill of Particulars petitioners learned the prosecution had and intended to use

at the trial (and subsequently did use at the trial) certain oral incriminating statements or confessions from each of the petitioners. A motion to suppress was filed in behalf of each petitioner and denied by the trial judge.

Harold J. Henderson, Chief Deputy in the Sheriff's Office in Avoyelles Parish, interrogated the defendants on the morning of April 19, 1964 and reduced to writing the statements. He testified he commenced interrogating Woodard at approximately 4:00 A.M., and that Deputy Hebert Bordelon and Chief Paul Dubea were in the office. Henderson's testimony with respect to what was told Woodard is as follows:

"Q. Did you tell him that he did not have to make a statement?

"A. I asked the District Attorney to bring his rights to him.

"Q. You asked the District Attorney to?

"A. Yes.

"Q. You didn't explain his rights to him at all yourself, did you?

"A. I might have said something—told him what the District Attorney said, but the District Attorney was in there at the time and I asked him to explain to Mr. Woodard his rights.

"Q. But you yourself did not undertake to advise him about any of their legal rights, did you?

"A. Yes.

"Q. What did you tell them?

"A. The District Attorney told Mr. Woodard and I told Mr. Hopper.

"Q. Told him what?

"A. Of his rights.

"Q. Well what did you tell him is what I want to

know and what did the District Attorney tell them what did you say and what did he say?

"A. **Well, I can't recall,** I can tell you in essence of what he said but I can tell you what I said..

"Q. All right, tell us first of all what you say the District Attorney told, we take Woodard first, and tell us what he told him in your presence.

"A. As I recall it he told Mr. Hopper—

"Q. Let's deal with Woodard first.

"A. I mean Mr. Woodard. Pardon me, it was my error. Mr. Woodard I sat down to take a statement or interview Mr. Woodard, and the District Attorney was there and I said—in essence—'before we go any farther, Mr. Roy as District Attorney explain to Mr. Woodard his rights.'

"Q. And what did he say?

"A. He told him that 'you don't have to make a statement if you don't want to and if you make a statement it can be used against you in a Court of law, you are entitled to an attorney' and that's the main things I recall him saying.

"Q. Did he ask them if they wanted to use the telephone to call an attorney?

"A. Not that I recall.

"Q. Did either of you tell them that they had a right to obtain counsel right then and there if they wanted to?

"A. Well no, I figured two intelligent college boys sitting by a telephone after they had that much explained to them they could use their own discretion as to what they wanted to do at the time. I thought we went at length in explaining their rights and especially that they didn't have to talk or say anything.

"Q. But you didn't tell them that they had a right

to immediately get a lawyer and they could call and get a lawyer if they wanted to.

"A. I told them they had a right to get a lawyer, call a lawyer.

* * * * *

"Q. Could you tell whether Mr. Woodard appeared to have been drinking, whether he was under the influence of alcohol to any extent?

"A. Well, I would say that he had been—appeared that he had been, but he had **sobered up somewhat at the time.**

"Q. He wasn't completely sober though was he?

"A. Well, having been the first time I ever saw him I wouldn't know how it affected him to that degree, whether he was—he wasn't incoherent, he responded to conversation and so forth, Mr. Woodard did.

"Q. You said a moment ago you could tell he had been drinking and he had sobered up somewhat. Is that what you meant to say?

"A. Yeah. He wasn't obnoxious or anything, he was calm and cooperative.

* * * * *

"Q. Did you or Mr. Roy tell Mr. Woodard what he was charged with or that he had been charged?

"A. I did not.

"Q. Did Mr. Roy tell him?

"A. Not that I recall. I couldn't say.

"Q. You didn't tell him that he had been charged at all or that he was going to be charged or anything of that nature?

"A. No, not prior to that.

"Q. Did either you or Mr. Roy tell him what offense you all were interrogating him about?

"A. Yes.

"Q. What offense did you tell him you were interrogating him about?

"A. I told him we were interrogating him—I didn't say interrogating, but we wanted to find out what happened at the Pelican Club.

"Q. But you **didn't mention any offense**, anything like murder or manslaughter or negligent homicide or assault and battery, battery, or anything like that did you?

"A. No, I didn't know what it was at the time.

* * * * *

"Q. Did either you or Mr. Roy ever tell either—or anybody else to your knowledge, tell either Mr. Woodard or Mr. Hopper that they had the right and privilege of using the telephone or the right and privilege to send a messenger for the purpose of communicating with an attorney or that of communicating with their friends, their relatives, for the purpose of securing an attorney?

"A. No, I just gave them a gist of their rights and had they been illiterates I might have gone into detail but college students, I—

"Q. The reason you didn't go into detail was because they were college students?

"A. Intelligent boys. That no one was taking advantage of them, we tried to make them understand that.

* * * * *

"Q. Now getting back to the statement that you got from Mr. Woodard, did you write that out in your own handwriting?

"A. I did.

* * * * *

"Q. Now, this statement is not a signed statement is it?

"A. No, it isn't.

"Q. Can you tell me why it was not signed?

"A. I read the statement or notes that I took, I read them back to him and I again advised him of his rights, that you are not required to sign this and he said 'well, I don't want to sign it' I said 'I prefer you didn't sign it.'

"Q. Did he say that there were some things that were wrong in what you read back to him?

"A. When I read it back to him I asked him if in essence that was correct statement, he said yes, but he didn't want to sign it. I told him I prefer that he didn't sign it.

"Q. Why would you prefer that he did not sign it?

"A. Because that wasn't his exact words.

"Q. Is that same thing true insofar as the statement of Hopper is concerned?

"A. Right.

"Q. Neither one of them are their exact words?

"A. That's right.

* * * * *

"Q. Are you saying that the only question then that—questions then that you asked them was regard to their names, ages, addresses and then asked them to tell you what happened?

"A. No, I wouldn't confine it to that. No. But they led in conversation, both of them. They were very cooperative and they tried the best they could to tell what happened.

"Q. Did you tell either one of them or anyone tell either one of them in your presence that these statements were being obtained from them to

determine whether or not charged would be filed against them?

"A. No, I don't recall telling them that. The only thing I told them that if they did give a statement it could be used against them in a Court of law."

Defendant Woodard and Defendant Hopper were respectively 20 and 21 years of age at the time of the alleged offense. Both were students at Louisiana Tech at Ruston, Louisiana. The alleged offense was committed shortly after midnight of Sunday, April 19, 1964. On the previous day, April 18, 1964, a Saturday, the defendants began their day at approximately 7:00 a.m. They ate no breakfast and attended classes that morning. For lunch they ate hamburgers and then at approximately 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon they decided to go to the Pelican Club in Marksville, Louisiana. The defendants, together with two other Louisiana Tech students Cyrus Frazier (sometimes referred to as "Billy" Frazier) and Charles Gaharan left Ruston in Woodard's automobile. On their way they stopped at Jonesville, Louisiana where they each purchased a six pack of beer most of which they drank before they got to Alexandria. They stopped at Alexandria and ate supper, each of them drinking another beer at that time. They proceeded on toward Marksville, stopped at the Ranch House Motel on the outskirts of Marksville. They rented a room at the Ranch House and then went on to the Pelican Club where they bought two fifths of whiskey. The Pelican Club is a large dance hall catering to young people desiring to dance and at which place alcoholic beverages are sold.

They drank most, if not all of the two fifths of whiskey, and additionally drank more whiskey given to them by mutual friends at the Club. They engaged in the usual

activities prevalent at such places, that is, drinking and dancing.

While at the Pelican Club the deceased Beeson became involved in an argument with persons other than the defendants who accused Beeson of stealing whiskey from their table. No altercation of any kind occurred in the club.

At approximately 1:30 the music at the Club terminated and for all practical purposes the Club closed for the evening. The accused, the deceased Beeson, Frazier, Gary Morrison and Winston Miller left the Club through the front door at approximately the same time. Gary Morrison and Winston Miller had accompanied the deceased Beeson to the Pelican Club, they traveling to Marksville in Beeson's car from Alexandria.

Shortly after they got outside of the Pelican Club the deceased Beeson struck the defendant Hopper with a whiskey glass, severely cutting Hopper's ear and neck.

The defendants contend that the deceased Beeson struck Hopper without cause or provocation. Shortly after this encounter the defendants, together with Frazier left the Pelican Club parking lot in Woodard's automobile and returned to their room at the Ranch House Motel.

Patrons of the Club found Beeson, at or near the slab or walkway along the side of the Pelican Club, bleeding, and called the Sheriff's Office. The testimony of the Deputy on duty at the Sheriff's Office was to the effect that it was reported that a truck had struck someone at the Pelican Club. Chief Paul Dubea of the Marksville City Police who happened to be in the Sheriff's Office at the time had an ambulance dispatched to the Club and he and his assistant went to the Pelican Club to investigate. When Chief Dubea arrived at the Club he found 40 or 50 patrons

of the Club around Beeson who was lying on the ground off of the slab and between the slab and a panel type truck which was used for transporting the band instruments for the musicians who played at the Club. Chief Dubea testified that these people who were around Beeson at the time were drunk and were cursing. A young lady named Ducote told Chief Dubea that she had seen three young men take off in an automobile and gave him a description of the car and its license plate number. **Without making any further investigation of any kind,** he immediately undertook a search in the Marksville area for the automobile. As a result of typical police procedure, the ownership of the automobile was determined to be that of the defendant Woodard. Chief Dubea found the automobile parked outside the Ranch House Motel. He observed blood on the inside of the car. He knocked at one of the rooms and upon being invited in found the defendant Woodard, Frazier, a young man named Nobles and Noble's wife, the latter two having arrived at the Ranch House Motel room of the defendants shortly after the defendants and Frazier had arrived there. Chief Dubea asked who owned the automobile outside, referring to the automobile that he was looking for and Woodard, who was lying on the bed in the room, stated that he was the owner. Chief Dubea then told the occupants of the room that "the boy that you all (sic) the fight with, he's dead". Chief Dubea then testified that one of the young men in the room admitted having beaten Beeson. At this point, Chief Dubea told the three young men in the room, Woodard, Frazier and Nobles, that they were under arrest and when one of them asked "What for?" Chief Dubea replied "For murder". Chief Dubea then took the three young men to the Sheriff's Office where they were interrogated.

At the time Chief Dubea was in the Ranch House Mo-

tel, the defendant Hopper was in the closet. Hopper was later taken to the Sheriff's Office by other officers.

While Frazier, Woodard and Hopper were in the radio room of the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's Department and together there, Frazier asked Deputy McNeal on duty in the radio room whether they (Frazier, Woodard and Hopper) could use the telephone. According to Frazier, the officer replied: "Just sit down and be quiet, not until we get through with you". In response to the question as to why he wanted to use the telephone, Frazier testified that he wanted to call "somebody to get me a lawyer or something and notify my parents and I was so scared I didn't know what to do and I wanted to get somebody that did know what to do."

The evidence disclosed on the hearing of the Motion to Suppress that there were several people apparently in an ugly mood around the Ranch House Motel when Chief Dubea arrived there, and there were numerous people in the hallway just outside the entrance to the Sheriff's Office when the accused were there.

According to Dr. F. P. Bordelon of Marksville, who attended defendant Hopper medically about 8:30 a.m. on April 19, 1964 and after statements were purportedly taken from Woodard and Hopper, Hopper's ear was severely cut and there were lacerations on his neck and head. On the trial of the case, Dr. Bordelon testified that the injury Hopper had could have caused his death had it been just a few inches away from its actual location because at that point a jugular vein could have been damaged, causing him to bleed to death. The doctor testified that the wound required nine sutures.

At the time Hopper was at the Sheriff's Office and at

the time he was interrogated by officers, he had not been given any medical attention whatsoever for the injured ear and neck, and according to the testimony of the officers themselves, when he was brought to the office he slumped in the chair as if something was wrong with him and his ear was bleeding. It is significant to note that the encounter between Hopper and the deceased Beeson occurred at approximately 1:30 a.m. and his interrogation by Major Henderson in the Sheriff's Office did not commence until approximately 5:00 a.m. The interrogation of Woodard commenced at approximately 3:00 a.m. Each of the accused was interrogated for approximately one to one and one-half hours. No medical attention whatsoever was given to Hopper until approximately 8:30 a.m.

Both of the accused had been awake from 7:00 a.m. Saturday morning, had no sleep and had consumed considerable beer and whiskey at the time of the interrogation by deputies on Sunday morning. From the time that they were brought to the Sheriff's Offiec until purported statements were taken from them by Major Henderson they were held incommunicado.

Deputy McNeal, to whom Frazier directed his request to use a telephone on behalf of himself and the two accused, never denied that he was asked permission to use the telephone. His responses to questions by counsel for defendants were "I don't remember if any of them asked me to use the phone or not" and "they could have asked me and I may have said something but I don't remember what it was" and he "wouldn't deny that they may have asked him that question". The Motion to Suppress Evidence sought to have excluded from the evidence in this case the two purported statements made by the defendants and which appear in the record as "Movers' Exhibits 8 and 9" and "State Trial Exhibits 10 and 11."

Part V. Cumulative Error.

In addition to all of the facts enumerated above in Parts I, II, III and IV, numerous other errors are alleged by petitioners to have cumulatively denied them of due process. Examples of these include:

A. Admission of gruesome autopsy color slides.

Dr. John Maxwell of Alexandria, a specialist in pathology, performed the autopsy on the instant victim on April 19, 1964, acting at the request of Dr. Henry J. Kaufman, Jr., Coroner of Avoyelles Parish. To better orient himself and for a diagnosis pertaining to the cause of death, Dr. Maxwell made pictures of the autopsy. He took color slides, which were later developed into photographs.

State's Exhibits 1-TB through 6-TB consist of: 1) a picture slide of a full face view of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 2) a picture slide of the right side of the head of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 3) a picture of the left side of the head of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 4) a picture slide of the under side of the brain of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 5) a picture slide of the floor of the skull of Joseph Ralph Beeson; and 6) a picture slide of both lungs of Joseph Ralph Beeson.

Counsel for the defendants objected to the offering of the slides in evidence for these reasons:

1) Proper foundation for their introduction had not been laid;
2) There was no predicate established that would permit the purported offering to be received in evidence;
3) They were taken at a time too remote to be relevant or material or of any probative value;
4) They were not necessary or material to any issue or fact involved in this case at that time;

the time he was interrogated by officers, he had not been given any medical attention whatsoever for the injured ear and neck, and according to the testimony of the officers themselves, when he was brought to the office he slumped in the chair as if something was wrong with him and his ear was bleeding. It is significant to note that the encounter between Hopper and the deceased Beeson occurred at approximately 1:30 a.m. and his interrogation by Major Henderson in the Sheriff's Office did not commence until approximately 5:00 a.m. The interrogation of Woodard commenced at approximately 3:00 a.m. Each of the accused was interrogated for approximately one to one and one-half hours. No medical attention whatsoever was given to Hopper until approximately 8:30 a.m.

Both of the accused had been awake from 7:00 a.m. Saturday morning, had no sleep and had consumed considerable beer and whiskey at the time of the interrogation by deputies on Sunday morning. From the time that they were brought to the Sheriff's Offiec until purported statements were taken from them by Major Henderson they were held incommunicado.

Deputy McNeal, to whom Frazier directed his request to use a telephone on behalf of himself and the two accused, never denied that he was asked permission to use the telephone. His responses to questions by counsel for defendants were "I don't remember if any of them asked me to use the phone or not" and "they could have asked me and I may have said something but I don't remember what it was" and he "wouldn't deny that they may have asked him that question". The Motion to Suppress Evidence sought to have excluded from the evidence in this case the two purported statements made by the defendants and which appear in the record as "Movers' Exhibits 8 and 9" and "State Trial Exhibits 10 and 11."

Part V. Cumulative Error

In addition to all of the facts enumerated above in Parts I, II, III and IV, numerous other errors are alleged by petitioners to have cumulatively denied them of due process. Examples of these include:

A. Admission of gruesome autopsy color slides.

Dr. John Maxwell of Alexandria, a specialist in pathology, performed the autopsy on the instant victim on April 19, 1964, acting at the request of Dr. Henry J. Kaufman, Jr., Coroner of Avoyelles Parish. To better orient himself and for a diagnosis pertaining to the cause of death, Dr. Maxwell made pictures of the autopsy. He took color slides, which were later developed into photographs.

State's Exhibits 1-TB through 6-TB consist of: 1) a picture slide of a full face view of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 2) a picture slide of the right side of the head of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 3) a picture of the left side of the head of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 4) a picture slide of the under side of the brain of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 5) a picture slide of the floor of the skull of Joseph Ralph Beeson; and 6) a picture slide of both lungs of Joseph Ralph Beeson.

Counsel for the defendants objected to the offering of the slides in evidence for these reasons:

1) Proper foundation for their introduction had not been laid;

2) There was no predicate established that would permit the purported offering to be received in evidence;

3) They were taken at a time too remote to be relevant or material or of any probative value;

4) They were not necessary or material to any issue or fact involved in this case at that time;

5) They were gruesome, ghastly, shocking, emotionally disturbing and were prejudicial, if received in evidence and viewed by the jury, to the rights of the defendants;

6) There was no dispute as to the cause of death; counsel had stipulated: —"Defense wishes to stipulate that Ralph Beeson died in the early morning hours of April 19, 1964; that his death resulted from trauma to the brain incidental to and attendant to a basal fracture of the skull."

7) That the autopsy and what was revealed thereby was not the handiwork of either defendant, but the handiwork and professional handiwork as a result of Dr. Maxwell;

8) That there was no probative value that could be attached to the offerings.

The trial court viewed the slides and then permitted the jury to review them projected on a screen.

B. Taking of evidence out of the presence of the defendants.

Lionel Bonstaff, Jailer with the Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, gave his testimony with respect to jail conditions and the events which occurred in the jail itself. After the District Attorney questioned the witness, the following colloquy took place:

"BY MR. GRAVEL:

Your Honor, in connection with the testimony of this witness the defendants request of the Court that the Jury be permitted to see the cell where these defendants were, and have without making any statement have Mr. Bonstaff demonstrate how he opens and closes that particular cell door. They will know and be able to visualize and see the cell and the area adjacent thereto.

"BY MR. ROY:

Your Honor, before you rule on this the State certainly has no objection to the Jury going up to the jail, as a matter of fact we would want them to go up but this is a very obvious attempt to impeach the testimony of Reverend Bell, who is not here to defend himself. I would like to ask the Court to withhold allowing the Jury to go up there. If this man can demonstrate such things I'd like to have Reverend Bell here to be able to demonstrate things to the Jury too, then we will all go up there.

"BY MR. GRAVEL:

Reverend Bell didn't even know which cell they were in.

"BY MR. ROY:

He can show which one he was in—

"BY MR. GRAVEL:

I'm not here to argue that, I think that the request in the light of the testimony of this witness and as part of the defense of this case we request—the request is one that certainly should be made—we do make it on behalf of the defendants, and ask Your Honor to grant the request.

"BY THE COURT:

I think we can work that out some time before it goes to the Jury.

"BY MR. GRAVEL:

Your Honor, I'd like to do that now, please, if I may.

"BY THE COURT:

I would have to have a conference with you gentlemen, there's some complications there that I don't know how to work out at this time.

"BY MR. GRAVEL:

I believe I can anticipate them, may we approach the bench?

"BY THE COURT:

Yes.

* * * * *

"BY MR. GRAVEL:

Yes, sir, by reference make it a part of the record, and by reference refer to it as 'defendant's Exhibit 22' (red Corvan Panel Truck inspected by the jury)—by reference I also make part of the record 'Defendant's Exhibit 23'—the jail. I think that's proper, Your Honor."

The jury had examined the jail cell at the time of counsel's statement. **Neither defendant was present** during the examination.

A reading of the testimony of record discloses that the testimony of the witnesses was contradictory with respect to the security and physical conditions, appearance, appurtenances, and visibility of the jail cell occupied by the defendants on Monday, April 20, 1964.

The purpose of counsel was to let the jury see for itself the cell occupied by the defendants on April 20, 1964, and then make its own decision as to the credibility of the witnesses' testimony with respect thereto.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Part I. Prosecutor's Conduct

All criminal trials are adversary proceedings. However, there are certain well defined limitations of the extent to which the prosecution can go in order to obtain a conviction and still give proper regard for the constitutional

rights of the accused to a fair trial. The primary duty of a lawyer engaged in public prosecution is not to convict but to see that justice is done.

It is submitted, that in the particulars set out in the Statement of Facts, the prosecution was guilty of gross misconduct in the course of the trial which denied petitioners their right to due process and a fair trial, and that further, the prosecution violated its duty to disclose to the defense admissible evidence which would have been useful to the defense and this failure to disclose resulted in prejudice to petitioners.

Principally what is involved is the suppression by the prosecution of evidence which would support and corroborate the defense testimony that Rev. Bell could not have seen or identified the petitioner Woodard at the time he allegedly made a statement and the affirmative argument by the prosecution to the jury a state of facts (tending to corroborate Reverend Bell) which the prosecution knew at the time to be false. The other acts of misconduct by the prosecution although constituting prejudicial error and violation of the accuseds' right to a fair trial in themselves are also particularly relevant to show the overall pattern and scheme of the prosecution motive. These other acts of misconduct suggest **why** the prosecution suppressed the testimony which would impeach Reverend Bell's testimony and **why** the prosecution argued and inferred a false conclusion as to the existence or nonexistence of toilets in the maximum security cell. The reason was to obtain a conviction without regard for the fundamental fairness or justice to which all defendants are entitled from the prosecution.

It is noted that the jury was permitted to inspect the maximum security cell. The two defendants however, were

not present at this time and therefore did not see what the jury had seen.

Ordinarily there might be no significance attached to the absence of the accused at the viewing of a scene such as involved in this case; however, the importance of their absence was brought into sharp focus in this case by reason of the remarks made by the District Attorney in his closing-rebuttal argument and which have been quoted hereinabove.

By those remarks the District Attorney in effect told the Jury that Reverend Bell must have been telling the truth when he testified about overhearing the incriminatory statement purportedly made by defendant Woodard.

The Sheriff, the Chief Deputy Sheriff, Captain Normand, and the Jailer had all testified that they had standing orders that the "maximum security cell" in the Avoyelles Parish Jail, in which the two (2) defendants and Billy Frazier were incarcerated at the time Reverend Bell testified that he went up to the Jail, was kept closed and locked and that occupants were not allowed to go in or out of the cell. As a matter of fact their food was handed to them through an opening in the iron door. It was clear from the testimony of the officers testifying as to the maximum security cell that in view of the fact that the door was kept closed at all times and the defendants and occupants were not allowed to go in and out of the cell that Reverend Bell could not have seen the three (3) individuals in the cell and could not have determined, from the position where he was standing, who made the statement referred to and to which he testified.

It was not until after the trial of the case that counsel for defendants were advised that the toilet facilities in the Jail Cell where defendants were incarcerated had been

removed just a short time before the trial of the case; or to put it another way, that at the time defendants were incarcerated in the maximum security cell **there were toilet facilities present** and accordingly, the District Attorney was laying before the Jury by his remarks, an insinuation of a non-existent condition contrary to the testimony of the State's own witness.

The evidence adduced in connection with the Motion to Set Aside the Verdict and for a New Trial revealed that the Special Assistant District Attorney knew that the toilet facilities had been removed just a short time before the trial, having been told this by Captain Normand of the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's Department, and the Special Assistant District Attorney admitted on cross-examination that he did not convey this information to the District Attorney even though he had this information prior to the time the District Attorney made the quoted remarks complained of in this Bill.

On the hearing of the Motion to set Aside the Verdict and for a New Trial, Captain Normand testified that he also told the District Attorney himself, that the toilet had been removed just a short time before the trial. It was this testimony that the District Attorney branded as "an unmitigated lie" when he took the witness stand at the hearing of the Motion.

When the toilets were removed from the maximum security cell, the defendants were not incarcerated therein nor were they incarcerated in that particular cell at the time of the trial when the Jury went up to the Jail to view the maximum security cell. The accused were in the maximum security cell shortly after their arrest and also on the morning when Reverend Bell testified that he went up to the Parish Jail and overheard the remark referred to.

Sometime later the accused were moved to another cell in which they remained up until the time of the trial. Since the District Attorney made the remarks to the Jury implying that there were toilet facilities in the maximum security cell while they were occupying that cell, on rebuttal, defense counsel had no way to call this to the attention of the Jury. Consequently, this was made an issue in the Motion for a New Trial.

What then is essentially involved is the credibility of the witness Reverend Bell and the suppression of evidence impeaching that credibility by the prosecution as well as the aggravated factor of the compounding of the prejudice by the remarks of the prosecutor fortifying Bell's credibility by a false inference of facts. In *Napue v. Illinois*, 360 U.S. at 269, 79 S. Ct. at 1177, this Court held that a conviction must fall under the Fourteenth Amendment when the prosecution "although not soliciting false evidence, allows it to go uncorrected when it appears" even though the testimony may be relevant only to the credibility of a witness.

The United States Supreme Court has stated as follows:

> "We now hold that the suppression of the prosecution of evidence favorable to an accused upon request violates due process where the evidence is material either to guilt or to punishment, irrespective of the good faith or bad faith of the prosecution." *Brady vs. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, in a habeas corpus matter arising out of a state conviction dealt with the same problem.

There, the state had knowledge that a psychiatrist and psychologist, engaged by it had rendered opinions that

the defendants were legally incompetent. The State, however, did not inform the defense of these opinions. The Court phrased the problem as follows:

> " . . . whether the failure of the District Attorney to disclose to appellant's counsel the fact, known to him, of the existence of opinions arrived at by specialists engaged by the State favorable to the accused if known in time for them to plan the strategy of, and conduct, their trial is such denial of due process to invalidate the trial." *Ashley v. Texas*, 310 F. 2d 80, 83.

The Court, through Chief Judge Tuttle, held that due process was denied stating the following:

> "We conclude that without any such expression from the trial counsel that the fact of the opinions of Drs. Crowe and Tracktir, favorable to the defendants, is of such vital significance to the accused persons in planning and conducting their defense, the failure of the District Attorney to inform their counsel of this fact amounts to such fundamental unfairness in the trial of a criminal case as to amount to a denial of due process. *Ashley v. Texas*, *supra*, at p. 85.

It should be noted, however, that the rule that the State must come forward with evidence favorable to the accused, together with the names of witnesses, has long been in existence. Indeed, it is even present in the Canons of Ethics of the Louisiana and American Bar Association. The basic reason for the rule is also expressed therein.

The Canon provides as follows:

> "The primary duty of a lawyer engaged in public prosecution is not to convict, but to see that justice is done. The suppression of facts or the secreting of witnesses capable of establishing the innocence

of the accused is highly reprehensible. Section 5, Article XIV, Articles of Incorporation, Louisiana State Bar Association printed at West's La. R.S., Vol. 21A (Title 37), page 165, 1964 ed. The Canon is the same as Canon 5, Canon of Ethics, American Bar Association."

Therefore, under both the law and rules of ethics, it is respectfully submitted that the District Attorney has a duty to furnish to the defendant information potentially favorable to him.

There are a plethora of opinions on the same point—that of the duty of the prosecution to come forward with evidence so that not only may a fair trial be held at the time of trial, but that the defense may adequately prepare its case, as set forth in *Ashley v. Texas, supra.*

It is urged that decisions in Federal courts have well established that suppression of evidence by the prosecution constitutes a denial of due process of law. See *Mooney v. Holohan*, 294 U.S. 103, 55 S. Ct. 340, 79 L. Ed. 791; *Pyle v. State of Kansas*, 317 U.S. 213, 63 S. Ct. 177, 87 L. Ed. 214; *Alcorta v. State of Texas*, 355 U.S. 28, ___ S. Ct. 103, 2 L. Ed. 2d 9; *Napue v. People of State of Illinois*, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S. Ct. 1173, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1217; *Miller v. Pate*, 386 U.S. 1, 87 S. Ct. 785, 17 L. Ed. 2d 690; compare United States ex rel. *Almeida v. Baldi*, 3 Cir., 195 F. 2d 815, 33 A.L.R. 2d 1407; United States ex rel. *Thompson v. Dye*, 3 Cir., 221 F. 2d 763; *Barbee v. Warden*, 4 Cir., 331 F. 2d 842.

More recently, this Court in *Giles v. Maryland*, 386 U.S. 75, 87 S. St. 793 (1967), applying the *Napue* case reversed and remanded for further proceedings a conviction where the prosecution had suppressed evidence which had bearing on the credibility of a prosecution witness.

The suppression of the evidence by the prosecution can best be understood when it is viewed in connection with the prosecution telling the jury on three occasions during the course its argument that it had pictures that the jury could not see because of defense objections. Similarly, the prosecutor displayed to the jury, as set out in the statement of facts, the clothing of one defendant and argued to the jury about a model both of which had been excluded from the evidence. It is obvious that the prosecutor is then asking the jury to convict not on the evidence presented to them but on the excluded evidence. This clearly violated the due process provision of the Fourteenth Amendment and denies petitioners their fundamental right to a fair trial.

If there can be any doubt that the prosecutor had a personal interest in the prosecution in conflict with the fair administration of justice then that doubt should subside when it is considered that the district attorney was a witness and testified several times for the state.

Before we enter into a discussion of the objection made to the District Attorney's testifying as a State's witness on material issues, we should like to point out that the District Attorney, by his own statement, at the time the Motion to Suppress was being heard, stated that he would probably be a witness later on but declined to testify when he was called by the defendants in connection with the hearing on the Motion to Suppress. It is obvious that the District Attorney knew at that time (when the Motion to Suppress was being heard) and before trial, that he would take the witness stand during the trial. This being the case, we respectfully submit that propriety required the District Attorney to recuse himself so as to bring himself within the principles enunciated by the various authorities which we shall cite hereinafter.

The District Attorney is competent to testify as to material facts within his knowledge. *Butler v. State*, 97 N.E. 242.

It has also been said that it is within the discretion of the Trial Judge to allow the prosecutor to testify. *Butler vs. State, supra.*

If the prosecuting attorney knew that it was necessary for him to become a witness, other counsel should be engaged in the case. *Ziegler vs. State*, 203 N.W. 872 (Wisconsin, 1926); *United States vs. Buono*, 247 F. 2d 838, 2nd Circuit 1957; *Robinson vs. United States*, 32 F. 2d 505; *Macon vs. Commonwealth*, 46 S.E. 2d 396; *Turner vs. State*, 55 So. 2d 228; *Mound vs. State*, 48 So. 2d 553.

In *State vs. Davis*, 164 So. 2d 589, the Court did not have before it the issue of a District Attorney testifying as a witness, but rather the question of the District Attorney making certain remarks to the jury in argument when he had not been anything but a spectator throughout the trial. In making the following statement which we quote from the Davis decision, The Louisiana Supreme Court stated the rationale for disallowing District Attorneys being both prosecutor and material witness in the same case:

> "Finally, to compound the injury and further prejudice the jury, the District Attorney, who did not try the case but was in the courtroom throughout the trial as a spectator, added his personal prestige, as well as the weight of his office, in the scales against the defendant, by making the following special plea to the jury in closing:
>
> > "Now in this case the only thing you've got to look for, the only thing in my opinion which is important, is whether or not you're going to

> believe the duly constituted law officials of the parish, including my own assistant, or whether or not you are going to believe this man, who through his own admission and who through cross-examination is a convicted criminal. That's what you've got to decide in this case and that's the only question you've got to decide."

Unquestionably the District Attorney in the instant case in taking the witness stand repeatedly to bolster the testimony of the State's case generally, did exactly what was condemned in *State vs. Davis, supra.*

In *Macon vs. Commonwealth, supra,* the defendant was charged with murder, found guilty of manslaughter and the conviction reversed. In the concurring opinion in *Macon* it was said:

> "I think his conduct of the trial however was fairly subject to criticism. There was a conflict between the Sheriff and the defendant as to what happened. The *Commonwealth* attorney was present on all the occasions the Sheriff testified about. He became a material witness to these transactions. When that situation developed he should have retired from the case and another should have been appointed to prosecute. Instead **by his method of questioning** he was able to impress upon the jury that he vouched for all the Sheriff said and by the same means he contradicted the defendant in his cross-examination of her. This is accomplished without being sworn as a witness and without submitting himself to cross-examination. This procedure was unfair to the defendant."

In *Macon* the Court condemned the District Attorney's throwing himself into the scales of justice by his method of examination and cross-examination. In *Macon* he was

not even a witness but still the Court disapproved of the method used to put over to the jury his personal belief or opinion.

In *Turner vs. State*, 55 So. 2d 228, the Supreme Court of Mississippi held that it was reversible error to permit the District Attorney to testify against the defendant over objection:

> "In the petition to correct a mistake in a decree filed in the Chancery Court which was attached to and made a part of the plea in abatement, it is stated that the District Attorney represented Christine Hill Turner, the first wife of appellant in a divorce proceeding and that the decree was rendered on February 6, 1950 and not on February 7, 1950. We are of the opinion that the **District Attorney** having participated in this proceeding **should have foreseen that more than likely he would be called upon to testify** and that **he should have withdrawn from the prosecution or refrained from testifying.**" (Quoting *Adams vs. States*, 30 So. 2d 593.)

In *Adams v. State*, (a Mississippi case) 30 So. 2d 593, the District Attorney participated in the search of premises involved in the prosecution of illegal possession and sale of intoxicating liquor and thereafter acted as prosecutor in the case. The Supreme Court of Mississippi held that it was reversible error to permit the District Attorney to act as witness and prosecutor.

In the case of *Jenkins vs. State*, 136 So. 2d 580, another Mississippi case, the prosecuting attorney testified that he had purchased whiskey from the defendant and also identified the defendant. The Court held that to permit a county attorney to act as prosecutor for the State and testify as a prosecuting witness constituted reversible error. In so deciding the Court in *Jenkins* said:

"* * * in conducting a criminal case the prosecuting attorney must be fair and impartial and see that defendant is not deprived of any constitutional or statutory right. Section 42 C., 18 C.J. 1314:27 C.J.S. 'District and Prosecuting Attorneys' Section 14. In this connection the authorities agree that the District Attorney is a quasi-judicial officer. Appeal of *Nicely, et al*, 130 PA. 261, 18 A. 737. In discussing this phase of the prosecuting attorney's duties, the Supreme Court of Oregon held that it is as much the duty of prosecuting attorneys to see that a person on trial is not deprived of any of his constitutional or statutory rights as it is to prosecute him for the crime with which he is being charged. *State vs. Osborn*, 54 Or. 289, 103 P. 62, 20 Ann. Cas. 627."

"The very nature of his function as a prosecutor necessitates that the District Attorney be a partisan in the case. Zeal in the prosecution of criminal cases is a praiseworthy and commendable trait in such an officer and not to be condemned by anyone. A fearless and earnest prosecuting attorney within the limitations upon his powers and perogatives is a bulwark to the peace, safety and happiness of the people. If convinced of the defendants guilt he should in an honorable way use every power that he has to secure his conviction. At the same time it is the duty of the prosecuting attorney who represents all the people and has no responsibility except fairly to discharge his duty, to hold himself under proper restraint and avoid violent partisanship, partiality and misconduct which may tend to deprive the defendant of the fair trial to which he is entitled. * * * it is the duty of the prosecutor to see that nothing but competent evidence is submitted to the jury; * * * 42 Am. Jur. Sec. 20, page 255."

The *Jenkins* case citing the *Adams* case went on to state the rule which we feel is prevalent in the United

States and which should have been followed in the instant case, which is as follows:

> "As to the eligibility of a District Attorney to be a witness for the State, in a case he is prosecuting, the general rule is that 'although a prosecuting attorney is competent to testify, his testifying is not approved by the Courts except where it is made necessary by the circumstances of the case, and, if he knows before the trial that he will be a necessary witness, he should withdraw and have other counsel prosecute the case. The propriety of allowing the prosecutor to testify is a matter largely within the Trial Court's discretion.' 70 C.J. 183, Sec. 247. We have a statute Section 3924, Code 1942, dealing as stated, *supra*, with pro tempore appointments of District Attorneys when the duly commissioned incumbent is absent or disqualified. It provides that 'the Court shall forthwith appoint some attorney at law to act for the State in the place of the District Attorney during his absence or inability or disqualification * * *'. We repeat that we think that the Trial Court was in error when the District Attorney was permitted to testify over objection of appellant, under the circumstances, where he was also acting as the prosecutor in the case."

In *Robinson vs. United States*, 32 Fed. 2d 505, the Assistant United States Attorney became a witness to rebut whether defendant was a witness in the case of *United States vs. Marsh* (a criminal proceeding). The Court stated:

> "Mr. Berwster, Assistant United States Attorney, became a witness on rebuttal to a most important and essential matter in the case, viz. whether or not defendant was a witness in the case of *United States vs Marsh* (a criminal proceeding), at the time he received the alleged bribe. No hard and fast

rule can be laid down as to when it is permissible for a prosecuting attorney to become a witness against the defendant and remain as prosecutor. Circumstances might arise in the trial of a case making it necessary that the prosecuting attorney or his assistant become a witness but these cases are few and exceptional. The function of a prosecuting attorney far greater weight than to that of the ordinary witness. Circumstances might exist where the prosecutor could not withdraw from the case. He might be the only attorney familiar with the case, and the only one engaged in the prosecution. The tendency of a situation where a prosecutor in a criminal case becomes a witness for the government is to prevent whatever that fair trial to which a defendant is entitled. If this were the only question in the case it might not be sufficient to warrant a reversal, but the practice of acting as prosecutor and witness is not to be approved, and should not be indulged in, **except under most extraordinary circumstances.** Here there were other counsel engaged in the case and Mr. Brewster could, we assume, have withdrawn without imperiling the Government's case when it was discovered that he was the necessary witness."

In *United States vs. Buono, supra,* the Assistant United States Attorney became a witness in order to contradict and impeach one of the United States witnesses. The Court in this case again deplored the practice of a Government prosecutor so injecting himself into the trial of a case unless doing so was unavoidable.

In *Ziegler vs. State, supra,* the Supreme Court of Wisconsin had for consideration an oral confession purportedly made to the District Attorney and the District Attorney later testified as to this confession in Court. The Court stated:

"The staetments made by the defendant to the District Attorney were freely and voluntarily made and were admissible in evidence."

"But we must deplore the practice indulged by the District Attorney in offering himself as a witness while he was in the active charge of the prosecution. This practice offends against the cannon of ethics of the American Bar Association which we said in *Royes vs. First National Bank*, 183 Wis. P. 21, 197 N.W. 237, states ethical considerations which must appeal to every lawyer as being sound. If such practice is to be discouraged in a civil case, certainly it is to be deplored in a criminal case. A District Attorney is a quasi-judicial officer and he should emulate the highest ethics of his profession. If he finds that the interest of justice requires him to testify in a criminal case he should withdraw from the active prosecution of the case and ask the Court to appoint some other attorney to perform the duties of a District Attorney in the trial of such case, under the provisions of Section 5944, Stats."

In *Butler vs. State, supra*, an Assistant Prosecutor was called as a rebuttal witness and his testimony was allowed. The facts in this case illustrates the situation where the District Attorney is not only competent to testify but had to become a witness for the State because of a situation that he could not anticipate in advance or he could not have known about in advance of the trial.

In the instant case, none of the extraordinary circumstances which would properly permit the District Attorney to become a witness in a case in which he was prosecuting existed. The District Attorney in the instant case knew well in advance as to what Chief of Police Dubea and other law enforcement officers' were going to testify to and he

did or should have fully realized in view of the pretrial pleadings filed by the defendants that the purported statements made by the defendants would be under attack on various statutory and constitutional grounds and generally he knew that he must at some time or other be a witness in the case. Under Louisiana Law there is ample provision made for substitute prosecutors. In view of all of these circumstances the District Attorney in this case had no valid reason to be both prosecutor and material witness for the State and the Court, in permitting him to testify time and again, more closely weaved the threads of errors during the course of this trial ultimately resulting in what we respectfully submit was not a fair and impartial trial and which denied to the accused their rights under due process of law.

Considering the totality of the circumstances the petitioners were effectively denied their right to a fair trial.

Part II. Severance

At the time of trial of the defendants Louisiana law provided in L.R.S. 15:316 (now repealed and replaced) that "Persons jointly indicted shall be jointly tried, unless the district attorney elect to place such persons separately upon trial, or unless the court, upon motion of defendant, shall, after a hearing contradictory with the district attorney, order a severance." However, since former L.R.S. 15:316 did not set any standards for the exercise of such authority, the Louisiana Supreme Court had to supply what is commonly known as the "antagonistic defenses" tests. Louisiana Courts have traditionally recited the proposition that:

> "It is true that where defenses are antagonistic and where confessions of each of the defendants incrimi-

> nate the other and it is intended to use such confessions in evidence, a severance should be granted . . . *State v. Cook*, 215 La. 163, 39 So. 2d 898 at 900 (1949).

This has caused the Reporter to the Louisiana Code of Criminal Procedure (effective January 1, 1967 — after date of trial) to state in the Official Revision Comment to Article 704 (replacing former LRS 15:316) that:

> "If a confession was made by A that the state intended to use against A, and it implicated B, then B could obtain a severance. (citations omitted). The reason for this rule was that the effect of the confession of A would be to permit A to testify against B without being subject to cross-examination."

> "A defendant was entitled to a severance if a co-defendant wished to use the former's testimony, since that would be impossible if they were tried together. (citations omitted). However, under R.S. 15:461 (3), a co-defendant can not without his consent be called, unless the former can get a severance from his co-defendant. Even if there is a severance, the co-defendant might still refuse to testify on the ground that his testimony might incriminate him. In that case, however, the defendant would have, for what is was worth, the benefit of his former co-defendant's refusal to testify." (West's Louisiana Statutes Annotated, Code of Criminal Procedure, Volume 2, page 283.)

Although the Louisiana jurisprudence is legion that antagonistic defenses and confessions by plural defendants mutually implicating each other are grounds for a severance, the simple fact is that this is a right recognized in

theory but denied in practice. See *State vs. Prague*, 243 La. 337, 144 So. 2d 352; *State vs. Cook*, 215 La. 163, 39 So. 2d 898 (1949); *State vs. Faciane*, 233 La. 1028, 99 So. 2d 333; *State v. Brazile*, 75 So. 2d 856; *State vs. Mack*, 243 La. 369, 144 So. 2d 363, cert. denied, 373 U.S. 917; *State vs. Birbiglia*, 149 La. 4, 88 So. 533 (1924); *State vs. Lamotte*, 168 La. 837, 123 So. 591 (1929); *State vs. Goury*, 184 La. 955, 168 So. 113 (1936); *State vs. Livesey*, 190 La. 474, 182 So. 576 (1938).

In the instant case, counsel for the state contended in its brief at page 15, and the Louisiana Supreme Court at 203 So. 2d 243 quoted approvingly from an earlier case, the proposition that an accused is not entitled to a severance as a matter of right and that the granting or refusal of a severance rests **entirely** within the discretion of the trial judge unless manifestly erroneous and arbitrary to the accused. It is respectfully submitted to Your Honors that the denial of severance in this case was arbitrary, manifestly erroneous and injurious to each of the accused for the reasons, among others, that the effect of such statements in this case was to permit each defendant to testify against the other without the benefit of cross-examination and without either having taken the witness stand in the trial.

Each defendant has challenged the right of the State to admit his statements or confession against **him individually,** and still urges that position. The issue here goes beyond that. It raises the question whether a jury should be permitted to hear the unsworn statement of a person other than the accused which is not subject to the truth testing qualities of confrontation and cross-examination. We are here concerned with very fundamental and basic constitutional rights. In *Pointer vs. State of Texas*,

380 U.S. 400, 403, 85 S. Ct. 1065, 1068, 13 L. Ed. 2d 923, this Court held that the Sixth Amendment right of an accused to confront the witnesses against him is a "fundamental right * * * made obligatory on the States by the Fourteenth Amendment." Confrontation of a witness is equivalent to cross-examination under oath in court. As this Court pointed out in *Pointer vs. Texas*, "It cannot seriously be doubted at this late date that the right of cross-examination is included in the right of an accused in a criminal case to confront the witnesses against him." 380 U.S., at 404, 85 S. Ct., at 1068. The seriousness of such a denial was made clear by this Court more recently wherein it stated, "(A) denial of cross-examination without waiver * * * would be constitutional error of the first magnitude and no amount of showing of want of prejudice would cure it." *Brookhart vs. Janis*, 384 U.S. 1, 3, 86 S. Ct. 1245, 1246, 16 L. Ed. 2d 314.

In this case there was certainly no waiver of the right of each defendant to exclude the statements of the co-defendant implicating him. Each filed a severance for that very reason — so that the admission of the co-defendant would not be heard by the jury in his trial and each reserved Bills of Exception to the trial judge's denial of these motions. Notwithstanding, the fact that the *Brookhart* case holds that no amount of showing of want of prejudice can cure a denial of right to cross-examination, the Louisiana Supreme Court, in its written opinion in reference to this issue stated at 203 So. 2d 243, 244, "We do not find that either defendant was arbitrarily affected by the ruling of the trial judge, or that either actually **suffered any prejudice** from a joint trial itself." Thus, in this instant case the Louisiana Supreme Court is not applying the standards announced by the United States Supreme Court in the *Brookhart* case. The issue

is not whether prejudice can be shown but rather whether the admission of the confessions of jointly tried defendants, neither of whom testify, constitutes denial of the right to confrontation and cross-examination of witnesses when the confessions implicate a defendant other than the one confessing. If it does, then under the *Pointer* case and the *Brookhart* case, defendants have been denied fundamental rights under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution irrespective of a showing of prejudice. These rights are so basic and fundamental to a fair trial that in a recent case where there was only a partial denial of the right of cross-examination, this Court reversed a conviction where the only thing the witness would not answer was his correct name and address. *Smith vs. State of Illinois*, ___ U.S. ___, 88 S. Ct. 748 (1968).

In view of the fact that each of the confessions implicating the co-defendants were admitted into evidence and in view of the fact that the foregoing authority and cases show that the admission of this damaging hearsay testimony was in violation of the fundamental rights of the respective accuseds individually, then on what rational basis did the trial judge, and thereafter, the Louisiana Supreme Court, deny the motion for severance and affirm the conviction? It appears from the opinion of the Louisiana Supreme Court at 203 So. 2d 243, note 8 that it was on the basis that the trial judge instructed the jury:

> "And, in the case of a confession, made outside of Court, by one defendant, it should not be considered by the jury as evidence against the other defendant who was **not present** or not a **party to such confession.**

* * * * *

> "Although there are two defendants and they are jointly charged with the same crime, it is your duty, Gentlemen of the Jury, to give separate, personal consideration to the case of each individual defendant. When you do so, you should analyze **what the evidence** shows with respect to that individual, leaving out consideration, entirely, any evidence admitted solely against some other defendant, each defendant is entitled to have his case determined from his own acts and statements, and the other evidence in the case as may be applicable to him."

A juror is not a tape recorder and, notwithstanding, a cautionary jury instruction, cannot erase from his mind the contents of a co-defendant's illegally admitted statement.

Even if it were conceded or held that instructions to a jury could have curative effects where an accused's fundamental rights under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution are violated, it would nonetheless be apparent that this instruction is sufficiently vague, with inaccuracies of such an extent, that it affords no genuine protection. A juror hearing such instruction could well assume that a confession made in the presence of the other defendant is admissible against both or that by being mentioned in the confession the co-defendant becomes a **party** to the confession. Such is not the case and this was never made sufficiently clear to the jury.

Petitioners respectfully urge to this Court that no amount of instruction to a jury can remove from the minds of a lay jury unschooled in the law the damaging and prejudicial effect of such evidence. Consider for a moment the effect of such a rule in the case of *Smith vs. Illinois*. Could the jury have been merely instructed to disregard

the testimony of the witness if full cross-examination were not permitted? This would have the effect of destroying the safeguards of the function of the judge who has a prime duty to insure the defendant a fair trial by excluding certain evidence that does not meet judicial and constitutional standards. It is these very safeguards which were preserved by this Court in *Jackson vs. Denno*, 378 U.S. 368, when this Court held that a defendant was constitutionally entitled to have a trial judge to determine the admissibility of a confession before it was heard by the jury which could probably not separate the issue of the voluntariness of an extra judicial statement from the issue of its truth. By logical implication the jury might rely on an unconstitutional statement because the jury is unable to expurge the statements and disregard them entirely once having heard them.

We urge the Court's attention to the review which appeared in Volume 24, No. 19 of the United States Law Week (34 L.W. 2261 "Criminal Law and Procedure") which reads as follows:

> "California defendant's confession that inculpates co-defendant cannot be used at joint trial even if it is admissible against the defendant and jury is instructed not to consider it against co-defendant."
>
> "In *Jackson vs. Denno*, 378 U.S. 368, 32 L.W. 4620, the Court held that a defendant was constitutionally entitled to have a trial judge or possibly a separate jury determine that his confession was voluntary before it was submitted to the trial jury for an assessment of its credibility. The Court did not believe that a jury could separate the issue of the voluntariness of an extra-judicial statement from the issue of its truth."
>
> "Although *Jackson* was directly concerned with

obviating any risk that the jury might rely on an unconstitutionally obtained confession, its logic extends to obviating the risk that the jury may rely on any inadmissible statements. If it is a denial of due process to rely on a jury's presumed ability to disregard the involuntary confession, it may also be a denial of due process to rely on a jury's presumed ability to disregard a co-defendant's confession implicating another defendant when it is determining that defendant's guilt or innocence."

"In joint trials when the admissible confession of one defendant inculpates another, and a confession is not deleted from the case, the jury is expected to perform the overwhelming task of considerating it in determining the guilt or innocence of the declarant and then of ignoring it in determining the guilt or innocence of any co-defendants of the declarant. A jury cannot segregate evidence into separate intellectual boxes. It cannot determine that a confession is true insofar as it admits that A has committed criminal acts with B and at the same time effectively ignore the inevitable conclusion that B has committed these same criminal acts with A."

"Whether or not the practice is constitutionally permissible, it is prejudicial and unfair to the non-declarant defendant and must be altered. In the absence, however, of a holding by the United States Supreme Court that the due process clause requires such change, the rules this Court now adopts ought to be regarded not as constitutionally compelled but as judicially declared rules of practice."

"When the prosecution proposes to introduce into evidence an extra-judicial statement of one defendant that implicates a co-defendant, the trial court must adopt the one of the following procedures:

1) It can permit a joint trial if all parts of the extra-judicial statement implicating any co-defend-

ants can be and are effectively deleted without prejudice to the declarant. By effective deletions we mean not only direct and indirect identification of co-defendants but any statements that could be employed against non-declarant co-defendants once their identity is otherwise established.

2) It can grant a severance of trial if the prosecution insists that it must use extra-judicial statements and it appears that effective deletions cannot be made.

3) If the prosecution has successfully resisted a motion for severance and thereafter offers an extra-judicial statement implicating a co-defendant, the trial court must exclude it if effective deletions are not possible. Similar rules concerning joint trial have been adopted in other jurisdictions and have been found workable. Traynor, Ch. J. Calif. Sup. Ct. *People v. Aranda*, 11-12-65."

In the instant case, after the Motion to Suppress the purported statements of the defendants was overruled by the Court, counsel for defendants filed a Motion for Severance on behalf of **each** defendant and the Court likewise overruled each of these motions, thereby forcing the defendants to go to trial together. The court well knew, as did the prosecution that in the event of a joint trial, the purported statements of both of the accused would be sought to be introduced into evidence despite the prejudicial effect of the statements to the defendants inter sese.

Although this Court, in *Delli Paoli vs. United States*, 352 U.S. 232, (1957) in a 5-4 decision, upheld a conviction of a defendant who was alleged to have been prejudiced by the admission into evidence of a confession by a co-defendant naming him, that case was in the opinion of the majority atypical for a number of reasons one of which

distinguishes it from the instant case. There was no pretrial motion for severance in *Delli Paoli* whereas there was an individual motion for severance by each petitioner in the instant case.

The continued vitality of the *Delli Paoli* decision is at least questionable in light of the Supreme Court's later decision in *Jackson vs. Denno*, 378 U.S. 368 (1964), holding that defendant was constitutionally entitled to have a trial judge determine that his confession was voluntary before it was submitted to the trial jury for an assessment of its credibility. In *Jackson* the majority quoted from the dissent in *Delli Paoli* to the effect that a jury should not be permitted to be influenced by evidence that as a matter of law they cannot consider but as a matter of fact they cannot disregard. 378 U.S. 368, 433-36 (1964). It has been suggested that "because of these close parallels between *Jackson* and *Delli Paoli*, *Jackson* may foreshadow a holding that the *Delli Paoli* procedure violates due process." *The Supreme Court, 1963 Term*, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 179, 213 (1964).

Part III. Unreasonable and Unconsented Interception of Conversation

The statement attributed to Woodard and which Reverend Bell testified he overheard could not have but had an effect on the jury. It was the only evidence purporting to show actual malice on the part of either defendant. Self defense was a major contention in this case and the evidence established that the first blow was struck by the deceased with a glass which severely cut one of the petitioners. All other statements (although argued to by inadmissible by petitioners) did not show the kind of malice or culpability as did the partial statement allegedly overheard by Reverend Bell. It is submitted that the burden

is upon the prosecution to show all of the circumstances surrounding an alleged inculpatory statement or confession and that the prosecution has failed to carry that burden in this type of case and must necessarily have failed in every case where it does not even purport to have heard the entire statement or even know that the statement was a complete thought or sentence.

Allowing this testimony to go to the Jury constituted prejudicial error which would warrant reversal of the conviction.

In view of the purported status of the witness, that of a Minister of the Gospel, it can readily be understood that what he testified to would have great weight with the Jury. It seems extremely odd to us why a Minister of the Gospel would go to the Jail to render spiritual help to prisoners and then when he overheard a remark (as he claims to have overheard) he would become angry, as he testified he did, and leave the Jail in a huff, and then tell the District Attorney about it two days later. However, be that as it may, we submit that the laws applicable to this situation certainly warrants a finding of reversible error in view of what is provided in Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:450 whichis as follows:

> "Every confession, admission or declaration sought to be used against anyone must be used in its entirety, so that the person to be affected thereby may have the benefit of any exculpation or explanation that the whole statement may afford."

The Bills of Exception here under discussion as well as the record related thereto show unquestionably that the incriminating portion of what the witness claimed to have heard was allowed to go to the Jury and admittedly the

witness did not remember nor could he testify as to what preceded or what followed the particularly incriminating statement.

In reversing a conviction for murder on the basis of a similar situation, in *State of Louisiana vs. Edward Hughes*, 29 La. Ann. 514, the Louisiana Supreme Court said:

> "First — Thomas McMahon, a state witness, was asked by the District Attorney to state a conversation he had with the prisoner relative to the homicide charge. The witness thereupon saying that he had had such conversation with the prisoner but that he could not remember said conversation, nor the substance thereof, the District Attorney thereupon asked said witness to state to the Jury what he could remember or what the prisoner had said in said conversation. The prisoner objected 'on the ground that the confession or declaration of the prisoner must be taken together and that such confessions or declarations were inadmissible unless it appears that the witness can state at least the substance of said conversation'. The Court overruled the objection and allowed the witness 'to testify as to such portion of said conversation as he could remember' stating to the Jury that the prisoner's objection 'went not so much to the admissibility as to the effect of the testimony'."
>
> Second — the witness Landry sworn for the State was asked whether he had ever heard any statements made by the accused and "if so, what statements he had heard". "The witness stated that **he had overheard a remark made by the accused from the Jail window in the course of a conversation which he,** (the accused) **was carrying on with a little boy outside;** that though he had noticed these parties in the conversation before he arrived at the jail, and had left them in conversation, **he had only**

heard the single remark to which he testified while he was passing by the jail and that **he had not heard either the preceding or subsequent portion of the conversation** of which this remark formed part." The accused made the same objection and the Court overruled it for the same reason'.

"We think the Court below erred in both these rulings. An admission, confession or declaration of a party cannot be given in evidence against him unless the witness testifying thereto can at least state the substance of all that was said. (Citations and Authorities)."

"We are not disposed to relax this salutary rule; for although such evidence, when we have satisfactory guarantees of its accuracy, may amount to the strongest proof, yet in the majority of instances, owing to infirmatives of memory, or to inattention, or misunderstanding in those called to state conversations with others, it is not very trustworthy. It would be utterly unreliable if fragmentary portions of conversations were received, for then a man might be made to say directly the contrary of what he did say."

We respectfully submit that the cited case is directly on all fours with the situation reflected by Bills No. 46 and 47, and should be the basis for reversal of this conviction just as it was in *Hughes*.

In addition to the fact that the partial or fragmented incriminatory statement is inadmissible per se, it is also urged that this Court should hold it inadmissable because of the matter and circumstances under which it was obtained.

It is urged that it is an error of constitutional dimensions to permit Reverend John Bell to testify at the trial as to petitioner Woodard's incriminating statements which

Reverend Bell allegedly overheard under the circumstances disclosed in the record. The use of statements obtained from an accused **without his knowledge** that they are being obtained for use against him at trial after his arrest and having been charged with an offense (by simple booking) violates the accused's Fifth and Sixth Amendment. Petitioners' Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights were violated by the admission of this statement because (1) he had been formally arrested and was being held in jail without bail, (2) he had not been furnished the services of an attorney nor had he obtained an attorney at the time the statements were allegedly made, (3) he had not been cautioned nor adequately warned of his rights under the *Escabedo* or *Miranda* decisions, nor had he intentionally and effectively waived such rights, (4) he did not know that his statement (or a portion of it) was being overhead, and (5) he intended that his conversation be private and did not waive his constitutional right to be secure against unreasonable searches or surveillance during his incarceration.

Although factually distinguishable, the instant case in terms of Constitutional issues is similar to *Massiah v. United States*, 377 U.S. 207, 84 S. Ct. 1199 (1964). In the *Massiah* case, this Court ruled inadmissible a confession freely and voluntarily made to a confederate by a defendant after indictment and while free on bail. This Court at 84 S. Ct. 1203 in *Massiah* said:

> "We hold that the petitioner was denied the basic protections of that guarantee when there was used against him at his trial evidence of his own incriminating words, which federal agents had deliberately elicited from him after he had been indicted and in the absence of his counsel. It is true that in the Spano case the defendant was interrogated in a police station, while here the damaging testimony was elicited from the defendant without his

> knowledge while he was free on bail. But, as Judge Hays pointed out in his dissent in the Court of Appeals, 'if such a rule is to have any efficacy it must apply to **indirect** or **surreptitious** interrogations **as well** as those conducted in **the jailhouse.** In this case, Massiah was more seriously imposed upon * * * because he **did not even know** that he was under interrogation by a government agent'." 307 F. 2d at 72-73.

Also in *Massiah* this Court quoted approvingly from a New York case the proposition that:

> "Any secret interrogation of the defendant, from and after the finding of the indictment, without the protection afforded by the presence of counsel, contravenes the basic dictates of fairness in the conduct of criminal causes and the fundamental rights of persons charged with crime. *People v. Waterman*, 9 N.Y. 2d 561, 565, 216 N.Y. S. 2d 70, 75 175 N.E. 2d 445, 448."

It is true that the *Massiah* case and the *Waterman* case deal with interrogations or incriminating statements after indictment and the instant case does not. It is submitted, however, that there is no real difference when you consider that the petitioners in the instant case were charged by booking and were in fact being held without bond. If anything their need for counsel was greater than that of the defendant in *Massiah* who was admitted to bail. By now it is abundantly clear that the right to counsel exists from the moment of arrest. *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964); *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602 (1966).

Although this Court declined to consider the contention in the *Massiah* case that Fourth Amendment rights were involved and chose to base its holding on the Fifth

Amendment and Sixth Amendment, this Court did have before it similar issues in *Katz v. United States*, 88 S. Ct. 507 (1967) and excluded electronically recorded statements of the accused **prior** to his arrest. With regard to the scope of the Fourth Amendment protection this Court in *Katz* said:

> "For the Fourth Amendment protects people, not places. What a person knowingly exposes to the public, even in his own home or office, is not a subject of Fourth Amendment protection. See *Lewis v. United States*, 385 U.S. 206, 210, 87 S. Ct. 424, 427, 17 L. Ed. 2d 312; *United States v. Lee*, 274 U.S. 559, 563, 47 S. Ct. 746, 748, 71 L. Ed. 1202. But what he **seeks to preserve as private,** even in an area accessible to the public, may be constitutionally protected. See *Rios vs. United States*, 364 U.S. 253, 80 S. Ct. 1431, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1688; Ex parte Jackson, 96 U.S. 727, 733, 24 L. Ed. 877". 88 S. Ct. 511.
>
> * * * * *
>
> "These considerations do not vanish when the search in question is transferred from the setting of a home, an office, or a hotel room, to that of a telephone booth. Wherever a man may be, he is entitled to know that he will remain free from unreasonable searches and seizures." 88 S. Ct. 515.

An application of the *Katz* case is warranted and the facts of the record clearly disclose that the petitioner Woodard did not willfully or knowingly disclose to the public the contents and nature of his **private** conversation in his cell with Billy Frazier, if indeed such a conversation occurred. (Frazier testified it did not).

Inasmuch as petitioner Woodard did not waive his Fourth Amendment rights under the *Katz* case by his

private conversation, while incarcerated, and inasmuch as *Massiah* precludes the use of incriminatory statements by the accused after the adversary procedure begins without his knowledge that they are being obtained for that purpose or without consent of his counsel, the admission into evidence of the testimony of Reverend Bell as to what he thought he heard violated the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights of the accused.

Part IV. Confessions

A. Whether confession admissible.

On the trial of the case timely objections were made to the introduction into evidence of the purported statements of the accused, the objections being set forth in Bill of Exception No. 24, Bill of Exception No. 25, Bill of Exception No. 27, Bill of Exception No. 38 and Bill of Exception No. 39. The additional objections were that the purported statements were obtained and made in violation of the defendants' statutory rights under Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:59, 60, 66, 67, 70, 77 and 78.

In the context of the operative facts and events from approximately 7:00 a.m. on Saturday, April 18th to approximately 8:30 a.m. on Sunday, April 19th, 1964 must be found answers to the following inquiries:

1) Was there a de facto arrest of the defendants at the Ranch House Motel?

2) Was their arrest lawful?

3) Were the defendants accorded their statutory and constitutional rights, privileges and immunities under the Constitution of the United States and the State of Louisiana?

4) Were the confessions or admissions purportedly made by the defendants (identified as "Movers'

Exhibits 8 and 9" in connection with the Motion to Suppress and "State Trial Exhibits 10 and 11" on the trial of the case "free and voluntary" as those terms have been defined and interpreted in the light of the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution?

5) Were the purported confessions or admissions of the accused admissible in evidence even if the concept of voluntariness was satisfied?

Unquestionably the defendants were put under "arrest" at the Ranch House Motel without a warrant of arrest. Any detaining by an officer of another against his will, or any interference with freedom of movement, even for a short time, and even if the purpose is to investigate an alleged crime constitutes an arrest. Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:58; *Rhodes vs. Jordan*, 151 So. 811; *Berry vs. Bass*, 102 So. 76; *U. S. vs. Festa*, 192 F. Supp. 160; *Henry vs. U. S.*, 80 S. Ct. 168; *Hundley vs. Millner*, 114 F. Supp. 206; *Marton vs. U. S.*, 147 F. 2d 28.

The arrest of the accused was **not lawful** for the reason that it was not based on "reasonable cause" or "probable cause" as defined in the jurisprudence. At the time the accused were arrested there was no "reliable information" for a "creditable person" which would lead the police officers to reasonably believe that the accused had committed a crime. As a matter of fact, the basis of arrest made by Chief Dubea of the defendant Woodard could not even rise to the dignity of a "mere conclusion" which basis for an arrest was condemned in *Aguillar vs. Texas*, 84 S. Ct. 1509. At the time of Woodard's arrest there could not be even a **suspicion** or **belief** that he had committed any crime. Chief Dubea admitted that the only information he secured at the Pelican Club was a description of an

automobile and the license number of the car but made no investigation whatsoever. Coupled with this is the testimony of Major Henderson that there was no basis for "booking" Woodard and Hopper until after their interrogation at the Sheriff's Office. An examination of other cases in addition to *Aguillar* will reflect that the arrest of the accused was not lawful because not made on "probable cause". See the following:

> *Ker vs. California*, 83 S. Ct. 1623; *U. S. vs. Rincke*, 229 F. Supp. 132; *Pigg vs. U. S.*, 337 F. 2d 302; *State vs. Aias*, 149 So. 2d 400; *State vs. Calcione*, 149 So. 2d 417; *Mallory vs. U. S.*, 77 S. Ct. 1356; *Duncan vs. State of Mississippi*, 176 So. 2d 840.

Perhaps the most flagrant violation of the statutory rights of the accused is revealed by a consideration of Louisiana Revised Statute 15:77. In part, this statute provides as follows:

> "All persons arrested shall, **from the moment of their arrest**, be **entitled to confer with counsel**, shall not be placed in solitary confinement in any jail or precinct station and denied the right to confer with counsel. They shall be given the **right and privilege of using the telephone** in the jail or station or send a messenger for the purpose of communicating with counsel and with his friends and relatives for the purpose of securing counsel. They shall also have the **right and privilege of using the telephone** in the jail or station or send a messenger for the purpose of communication with any person, firm or corporation in order to secure their release by bail, parole and such person, firm or corporation contacted or communicated with shall have the right to visit said arrested person within a reasonable time if not charged with a crime in which no release or bail is allowed by law."
>
> "No peace officer or other person making an arrest

shall neglect, fail nor refuse to immediately conduct the person arrested to the nearest jail or police precinct station and immediately cause him to be booked. Such neglect or refusal shall be prima facie evidence of proof of violation of this section."

Cyrus Frazier testified that when he, Woodard and Hopper were together in the radio room at the Sheriff's Office shortly after being brought there, he, Frazier, asked Deputy McNeal if he could use the telephone. Frazier further testified that this request was denied. Deputy McNeal did not deny that any such request was made by Frazier, nor did he deny that the request was refused.

Additionally, as we have pointed out hereinabove, the constitutional rights, privileges and immunities of the accused as interpreted by the jurisprudence of the United States Supreme Court was unquestionably denied to them.

The confessions or admissions purportedly made by the defendants could not be said to be "free and voluntary" in the light of the totality of circumstances as revealed by the evidence which we have outlined above.

Even if the purported confessions or admissions of the accused fit the concept of voluntariness as defined by the jurisprudence, it should not have been admitted in evidence for the reason that it was secured during a period of unlawful detention. *Mallory vs. U.S., supra; Fahy v. Connecticut*, 84 S. Ct. 229; *Wong Sun vs. United States*, 83 S. Ct. 407; *State vs. Marchetti*, 173 So. 2d 531; *Mapp vs. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643; *24 La. Law Review 340.*

Professor Pugh states in his article in Volume 24 at Page 343 of the Louisiana Law Review that the McNabb-Mallory rule has been rejected by the Louisiana courts. This statement, of course, was made prior to the Louisiana

Supreme Court's decision in *State vs. Davidson*, 177 So. 2d 273. It is respectfully submitted that the McNabb-Mallory rule should not continue to be rejected in the light of *Davidson* which imposes on a defendant in a Louisiana court prosecution the obligation to follow the Federal Rule with respect to Motions to Suppress evidence. It is further submitted that *Davidson* incorporates in the Louisiana rules of Criminal Procedure all the related exclusionary rules of the Federal Procedure.

If it should be argued by the State that it is the rule in Federal prosecution that confessions obtained during an illegal detention must be suppressed (*Mallory vs. United States, supra; McNabb vs. United States*, 318 U.S. 332) but that this exclusionary rule is a function of the supervisory power of the Federal courts over Federal prosecutions, and does not rise to the dignity of a constitutional prohibition, we should like to call the Court's attention to the recent ruling of The Louisiana Supreme Court in *State of Louisiana vs. Davidson, supra*, wherein the court imposed on defendants in Louisiana prosecutions the burden of following Federal rules with respect to Motions to Suppress. In *Davidson*, the court stated:

> "In any event we believe that since the exclusionary rule must be applied in all State criminal cases in accordance with edict in *Mapp vs. Ohio*, the procedural rights of the accused should also conform with the standard provided by the Federal Courts and that he should not be accorded by the Trial Courts of this State any less onerous procedure than he would have had if he had been tried before a Federal Court".

In view of the foregoing pronouncement by The Louisiana Supreme Court it would seem fair and logical to

apply the rule of *McNabb* and *Mallory* with respect to confessions, admissions or incriminatory statements **taken during an illegal detention.**

A consideration of the statutes and particularly Louisiana Revised Statute 15:77 leads to conclusion that the defendants were not accorded their rights under the statute of Louisiana, particularly when they were not allowed to use the telephone or send a messenger for the purpose of communicating with counsel and with friends and relatives for the purpose of securing counsel. The very fact of their incommunicado status was a flagrant violation of their statutory rights and any statements made during the illegal detention and denial of their statutory rights affected the statements subsequently made by them with illegality and invalidity. (*See Wong Sun vs. U.S.*)

It is most significant that Deputy McNeal never denied that he was asked permission by the accused to use the telephone when they were brought to the Sheriff's Office and placed in the radio room where he, McNeal, was in charge. It is not enough that Deputy McNeal stated that **"he could not remember"** any requests to use the telephone. In *Haynes vs. State of Washington*, 83 S. Ct. 1336 one of the officers testified that Haynes **"may have"** asked permission to call his wife. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in this instance that this was not sufficient rebuttal of the defendant's claim and left exposed for review by the Court only the defendant's evidence or testimony and that this would be sufficient on review by the Court to establish the existence of impermissible police conduct barring use of the written confession ultimately obtained.

Major Henderson testified (see Page 184 of Motion

to Suppress Transcript Page 696) that neither he nor the District Attorney ever told either of the defendants nor any of the witnesses who were interrogated that they had a right and privilege of using the telephone or the right and privilege to send a messenger for the purpose of communicating with an attorney or communicating with their friends or relatives for the purpose of securing an attorney. Major Henderson further testified that he "figured" that Woodard and Hopper should have known their rights in view of their age and the fact that they were college students, and from the fact that they were college students "they must have studied government" and **should have known their rights.**

Deputy Bordelon testified (Page 246 of the Motion to Suppress Transcript Page 758) that it was only after the statement had been completed that the District Attorney told Woodard that he could get a lawyer.

Major Henderson also testified (Page 179 of the Motion to Suppress Transcript Page 691) that he asked the District Attorney, who was present, to tell Mr. Woodard his rights; that he, Major Henderson, told Hopper his rights. He further testified that the "rights" which Woodard and Hopper were told about were in essence as follows:

> "(District Attorney to Woodward) 'You don't have to make a statement. If you would want to and if you make a statement it can be used against you in a court of law; you are entitled to an attorney' ".

Major Henderson also testified (Page 183 of the Motion to Suppress Transcript Page 695) that he could not "recall" having mentioned to Woodard or Hopper what offense that he was interrogating him about. He further testified that he did not "recall" telling them that they

had a right to have a lawyer present while any statements were being given.

We readily concede that there is no "litmus-paper test" that a Court can look to or apply in order to determine whether a statement amounting to a confession was made voluntarily, that is, that it was the product of a free will. However, we respectfully submit when all of the relevant factors are considered and weighed together, which the Court must do (see *Culombe vs. Connecticut*, 367 U.S. 568, 601, and *Lynumm vs. Illinois*, 82 S. Ct. 917), a priori argument can be forcefully made that the statements purportedly made by these accused, and which are under attack, were not freely and voluntarily given.

The facts in this case reveal that the two accused were both young men, immature and not knowledgeable as to police procedures and techniques, particularly the more sophisticated techniques such as securing the faith and confidence of the accused with no indication on the part of the police of the dire results which might follow their giving a statement. Both young men were at the time of their interrogation obviously tried, did not have the full and normal use of their faculties, were apprehensive, were in a "strange country" so to speak, among people, none of whom they knew, still affected by the large quantity of alcoholic beverages that they had drunk. With respect to Hopper, we have the foregoing factors plus the severe injury to his ear and neck which must have caused him considerable pain and anxiety. The weakened condition of the defendants, particularly Hopper, when combined with the lack of any warning to either of them as to the constitutional safeguards to which they were entitled and their illegal detention could create an inference that the con-

fession or admission purportedly made by them was a product of an overborne mind.

Failure of the police to allow them to use the telephone for the purpose of securing advice and counsel from either an attorney or friends as the statute of Louisiana requires, the failure of the police to warn them of their constitutional right to remain silent and their constitutional right to counsel and to inform them that anything they might say could be held against them, the failure of the police to advise them as to the consequences that might follow from their giving a statement, the failure of the police to even remind them as to the purpose of the interrogation should, we respectfully submit, dissolve the contention made by the State that their confessions or admissions were freely and voluntarily given. Even if we take the District Attorney's testimony and that of Major Henderson as unimpeached (which we do not concede), we respectfully submit that the warning given by the District Attorney and/or Major Henderson falls far short of the minimum effective warning that the accused are entitled to under the law.

The concept of right to counsel as recently enunciated by the United States Supreme Court and various State Supreme Courts and Federal Courts of Appeal has as its core, as it must have, an effective warning and advice by the police as to the rights of the defendants, and not merely the superficial reference to an unexplained right such as were claimed to have been made by th District Attorney and Major Henderson to these two accused.

The United States Supreme Court has taken the position that confessions are excluded not only because they may be unreliable but also because they offend the concept of the accusatory system an essential part of the funda-

mental legal philosophy under which this nation was founded. See *Watts vs. Indiana*, 338 U.S. 49.

> "Our decisions under that Amendment (The Fourteenth) have made clear that convictions following the admission into evidence of confessions which are involuntary, i.e. the product of coercion, either physical or psychological, cannot stand. This is not so because such confessions are unlikely to be true but because the methods used to extract them offend an underlying principle in the enforcement of our criminal law: That ours is an accusatoral and not an inquistitoral system * * * a system in which the State must establish guilt by evidence independently and freely secured and may not by coercion prove its charge against an accused out of his own mouth." *Rogers vs. Richmond*, 365 U.S. 534. These same concepts have compelled a greater reliance on the presence or absence of counsel as a fatcor in determining the voluntariness of a confession". *Haynes vs. Washington, supra; Lynumm vs. Illinois, supra; Culmobe vs. Connecticut; supra; Spano vs. New York*, 79 S. Ct. 1202; *Leyra vs. Denno*, 75 S. Ct. 716.

The right to counsel as pronounced in *Gideon* has been expanded as reflected by the cases which followed *Gideon* such as *Hamilton vs. Alabama*, 82 S. Ct. 157, which held that the accused was entitled to counsel at "arraignment" even if a plea of "not guilty" was entered, and that the accused were entitled to counsel at any "critical stage"; and *White vs. Maryland*, 83 S. Ct. 1050 which ruled that accused were entitled to counsel at a "preliminary hearing". (Also see *Carnley vs. Cochran*, 82 S. Ct. 884).

In 1964 the United States Supreme Court decided the case of *Escobedo vs. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478. Subsequently, the Supreme Court of the State of California in *People vs.*

Dorado, 394 P. 2d 952, interpreted *Escobedo* to mean that once an investigation of a homicide was focused on a defendant, any incriminatory statements given by the defendants during the interrogation by investigating officers became inadmissible in the absence of counsel, and by failure of the officers to advise defendant of the right to remain silent, and the admission or confession obtained in such manner required reversal. There has been some difference of opinion as to whether *Escobedo* in fact held what *Dorado* said it held. However, on June 1, 1965 (85 S. Ct. 1793) the United States Supreme Court denied "certiorari" in *Dorado* and therefore it might be supposed that the United States Supreme Court approved the interpretation placed on *Escobedo* by the *Dorado* decision.

There is no sound basis for the argument that a **request** for counsel is a prerequisite to the right to counsel at the interrogation stage while it is not at any other. The test of waiver should be the same regardless at what stage of the proceedings it became an issue. In *Escobedo* the Supreme Court said:

> "The accused may, of course, **intelligently** and **knowingly** waive his privilege against self-incrimination and his right to counsel either at a pretrial stage or at the trial." (Emphasis supplied).

The Supreme Court of Oregon has also held that the failure to warn an accused of his rights to **remain silent** requires that the confession be suppressed. *State vs. Neely*, 395 P. 2d 557 (1964). See also *Commonwealth vs. McCarthy*, 200 N.E. 2d 264, (1964); *State vs. Dufour*, 206 A. 2d 82 (1965); *State vs. Hall*, 397 P. 2d 261 (1964); *Campbell vs. State*, 384 S.W. 2d 4 (1964).

In *Russo vs. New Jersey*, 351 F. 2d 429 (3rd CCA—

Rehearing denied October 13, 1965) defendants who were without counsel and **were not informed** of either their right to counsel or to their right to remain silent at the **time of their interrogation** which led to confessions admitted in prosecutions, were denied their right to counsel and were held entitled to habeas corpus in absence of an effective waiver of the right.

In *Miranda vs. Arizona*, 86 S. Ct. 1602 (1966) the court held not only must an accused's right to remain silent and to the assistance of counsel be jealously guarded at the stationhouse but waiver of those rights may be proved only by the most convincing evidence.

The heart of the majority's holding is that the Fifth Amendment reaches into the siationhouse and requires that the accused be **adequately** and **effectively** apprised of his rights and that the exercise of those rights be fully honored by the police.

The majority holds, the accused must be informed in clear and unequivocal terms that he has the right to remain silent, that any statement he does make may be used as evidence against him, and that he has the right to counsel. Moreover, the need for counsel to protect the Fifth Amendment privilege comprehends not merely a right to consult with counsel prior to questioning, but also to have counsel present during any questioning if the accused so desires. This means that the police must make known to the accused that he is entitled to a lawyer and that if he cannot afford one, a lawyer will be provided for him prior to any interrogation.

The Court stated incommunicado interrogation of an accused in police-dominated atmosphere, while not physical

intimidation, is destructive of human dignity and is at odds with the principle that an accused may not be compelled to incriminate himself.

To illustrate the heavy burden resting on the state to demonstrate that an accused knowingly and intelligently waived his privilege against self-incrimination and his right to retained or appointed counsel, the majority notes that a valid waiver will not be presumed simply from the silence of the accused after warnings are given or simply from the fact that a confession was eventually obtained. Nor can there be any room for the contention that the privilege is waived if the accused answers some questions or gives some information on his own prior to invoking his right to remain silent when interrogated. The fact of lengthy interrogation or incommunicado incarceration before a statement is made is strong evidence that the accused did not validly waive his rights.

Unless the record shows that an accused was **offered counsel** but intelligently and **understandingly rejected the offer,** there is no waiver of his right to counsel. (As to what constitutes "waiver" see *Carnley vs. Cockran, supra.*)

Major Henderson of the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's Department testified that he did not feel that an explanation to the accused of their constitutional rights was necessary since they were college boys and "had studied government". We respectfully submit that it cannot be logically argued that every college student is aware of his rights under the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. The instant case is not one involving an accused such as there was in *Crooker vs. California,* 78 S. Ct. 1287. There the accused had been a law school student, had studied criminal law and when asked

to take a lie detector test informed the operator that the results of such a test would not be admissible at trial absent a stipulation by the parties; and the manner of the accused refusals to answer questions by the police indicated full awareness of the right to be silent. As a consequence of his background, the Court found that his confession was voluntary.

More apropos to the instant case is that of *Haynes vs. State of Washington, supra.* In *Haynes* the accused was held incommunicado without permitting him to telephone his wife until after he had made a written confession. The United States Supreme Court reversed the conviction. The Court considered pertinent the facts that (1) he was not taken before a magistrate and granted a preliminary hearing until he had acceded to the demands that he give and sign a written statement; (2) that there was no indication in the record that prior to signing the written confession or even thereafter Haynes was advised by authorities of his right to remain silent; (3) the police did not warn him that his answers might be used against him; (4) he was not told of his rights respecting consultation with an attorney.

It should be noted at this point that the trial court in the instant case refused to give the jury special charges concerning the rights, privileges and immunities to which the accused were entitled under the law and which affected the voluntariness of the confession or admission introduced into evidence. In *Haynes vs. State of Washington, supra,* the Court commented as follows:

> "The Jury was instructed in effect not to consider as relevant on the issue of voluntariness of his confession the fact that the defendant is not reminded that he is under arrest, that he is not cautioned that

he may remain silent, that he is not warned that his answers may be used against him or that he is not advised that he is entitled to counsel."

"Whatever independent consequences these factors may otherwise have, they are unquestionably attendant circumstances which he accused is entitled to have appropriately considered in determining voluntarines and admissibility of his confession."

In *Reck vs. Pate*, 81 S. Ct. 1541, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the conviction of murder. Reck, the accused, was a nineteen year old youth of subnormal intelligence which, of course, is not involved in the instant case. However, the Court did consider other factors holding that there had been a violation of due process; and in reversing the conviction those factors pertinent to this issue were the long stretches of interrogation while he was held **incommunicado** and while he was **physically weakened** and in intense **pain.**

The totality of the circumstances involved in this case should be sufficient to cause substantial concern as to whether due process was accorded to the two young accused in this case. Conduct on the part of the law enforcement officers, any one or combination of which have been condemned by the United States Supreme Court are:

1) Prolonged questioning (five hours—*Haley vs. Ohio*, 68 S. Ct. 302; eight hours—*Spano vs. New York*, 79 S. Ct. 1202).

2) Failure to advise accused of his right to counsel (*Haley vs. Ohio, supra; Haynes vs. Washington, supra; Payne vs. Arkansas*, 78 S. Ct. 844).

3) Failure to remind accused he is under arrest: (*Haynes vs. Washington, supra; Payne vs. Arkansas, supra*).

4) Failure to caution him that he may remain silent (*Haynes vs. Washington, supra; Payne vs. Arkansas, supra*).

5) Failure to warn accused that his answers may be used against him (*Haynes vs. Washington, supra; Payne vs. Arkansas, supra*).

6) Deprivation of food or sleep (*Reck vs. Pate, supra; Payne vs. Arkansas, supra*).

7) Use of psychological techniques (*Leyra vs. Denno*, 74 S Ct. 716).

8) Threat of mob violence (*Payne vs. Arkansas, supra; State of Louisiana vs. Rideau*, 83 S. Ct. 1417).

9) Exposure to crowds (*Reck vs. Pate, supra*).

10) Psychological compulsion (*Haynes vs. Washington, supra*—accused not allowed to telephone wife; *Lynumm vs. Illinois, supra*—police told the accused welfare support of her children would be stopped).

11) Confession given while accused was physically weakened or in pain (*Reck vs. Pate, supra*).

12) Confession secured through trickery (*Spano vs. New York, supra*).

B. Whether Johnson v. New Jersey should be limited to its facts or whether it applies to instant case.

Principally, petitioners seek to bring before this Court the question of whether the Court should re-examine and limit to its particular facts the holding in *Johnson vs. New Jersey*, 384 U.S. 719, 86 S. Ct. 1772 (1966), relative to the date of application *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602 (1966), inasmuch as the constitutional issues

had not been raised at trial in the *Johnson* case and the *Johnson* case dealt with a COLLATERAL attack on a judgment which had become FINAL long before the *Miranda* decision, but petitioners, on the contrary, bring before this Court a judgment which has not become final and assert that they are being denied the Equial Protection of Law under the Fourteenth Amendment by the application of the *Johnson* case because they did affirmatively assert and raise the same constitutional issues at the time of trial.

Secondly, petitioners show that the *Johnson* case does not absolutely preclude the retroactive application of the *Miranda* case as to the issue of determination of the freeness and voluntary nature of confessions, but on the contrary admonishes that its ruling should be used as a standard in such determinations.

Petitioners submit to the Court:

1) *Miranda* did not create new rights and therefore its ruling should apply in the instant case.

2) *Johnson* is factually distinguishable on material points and should not apply to the instant case.

3) The application of the *Johnson* case to the instant case denies petitioners the Equal Protection of law as petitioner timely asserted their right to exclude the unconstitutionally obtained confessions at and before TRIAL just as the defendants did in *Miranda*.

4) In any event, the Louisiana Supreme Court erred in not applying the standards and constitutional principals enunciated in *Miranda* to determine the issue of whether the confessions were free and voluntary.

Taking these points one at a time, it is rsepectfully urged that *Miranda v. Arizona* did not create new law but merely applied existing constitutional guarantees. This, it is submitted, the Court recognized in the *Miranda* decision at 384 U.S. 442, 86 S. Ct. 1611 when it stated:

> "We start here, as we did in *Escobedo*, with the premise that our holding is not an innovation in our jurisprudence, but is an application of principles long recognized and applied in other settings. We have undertaken a thorough re-examination of the *Escobedo* decision and the principles it announced, and we reaffirm it. That case was but an explication of basic rights that are enshrined in our Constitution—that 'No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself,' and that 'the accused shall * * * have the Assistance of Counsel'—rights which were put in jeopardy in that case through official overbearing. These precious rights were fixed in our Constitution only after centuries of persecution and struggle. And in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, they were secured 'for ages to come, and * * * designed to approach immortality as nearly as human institutions can approach it.' *Cohens v. Commonwealth of Virginia*, 6 Wheat. 264, 387, 5 L. Ed. 257 (1821)."

It is therefore urged that these same constitutional guarantees were in effect at the time of petitioners trial and should have been recognized and protected. Certainly they could have done nothing more to assert these rights.

The *Johnson* case is distinguishable from the instant case which is on direct appeal in many material matters. This distinction can best be illustrated by quotation from the *Johnson* case wherein it was stated:

> "In this case we are called upon to determine wheth-

er *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S 478 (1946), and *Miranda v. Arizona*, *ante*, p. ____, should be applied retroactively. We hold that *Escobedo* affects only those cases in which the trial began after June 22, 1964, the date of that decision. We hold further that *Miranda* applies only to cases in which the trial began after the date of our decision one week ago. The convictions assailed here were obtained at trials completed **long before** *Escobedo* and *Miranda* were rendered, and the rulings in those cases are therefore inapplicable to the present proceeding.

* * * * * *

"While the **present collateral proceeding** was pending following our decision in *Escobedo*, Cassidy filed affidavits in the New Jersey Supreme Court which detailed for the **first time** certain supposed circumstances of his confession.

* * * * * *

"Like Cassidy, Johnson filed affidavits in the New Jersey Supreme Court in this **collateral proceeding** following our decision in *Escobedo*, detailing for the first time certain supposed circumstances of his confession.

* * * * * *

"**These belated claims** like Cassidy's were left uncontroverted by the State and were accepted as true by the court below for resolution of the *Escobedo* issue.

"The confessions of Johnson and Cassidy were offered in evidence by the State at their joint trial for felony murder. The judge held a hearing out of the presence of the jury on the voluntariness of the confessions. Petitioners **made no effort to rebut** the testimony adduced by the State relating to this issue. The judge found the confessions voluntary and admitted them into evidence. Petitioners then

expressly **relinquished their right** under state law to have the issue of voluntariness, and the accompanying evidence, submitted to the jury for redetermination. They did not introduce any testimony to dispute the correctness of their confessions.

"In summation at the close of trial, defense counsel explicitly asserted that the confessions were truthful and pleaded for leniency on this ground. Cassidy's lawyer stated to the jury:

> 'Whatever is in this statement made by Stanley Cassidy is true. I know it is true . . . (M)y reason for knowing that it is true is because of the meetings and consultations I have had with Stanley. We have been over this many, many times.
>
> "I know it is true because I know Chief Dube, and Chief Dube is a fine interrogator. If you do not answer truthfully, believe me, he will question you until he does get the truth, and Chief Dube got the truth."

Likewise Johnson's lawyer told the jury:

> "The statement of Johnson was truthful and honest, because when that was finished, that was the end of it.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "There were no threats. There was no attempt to evade. There was no trickery. Anything that Chief Dube asked him he answered honestly and truthfully."

The jury found Johnson and Cassidy guilty of murder in the first degree without recommendation of mercy, and they were sentenced to death.

"The convictions of Johnson and Cassidy **became final six years ago,** when the New Jersey Supreme Court affirmed them upon direct appeal and the

> time expired for petitioners to seek certiorari from the decision. There followed a battery of collateral attacks in state and federal courts, based on new factual allegations, in which petitioners repeatedly and unsuccessfully assailed the voluntariness of their confessions. This appeal arises out of still another application for post-conviction relief, accompanied by a **fresh set of factual allegations,** in which petitioners have argued in part that their confessions were inadmissible under the principles of *Escobedo.*"

While portions of the above quoted opinion in the *Johnson* case purports to have application to the instant case, it is also quite evident that this Court did not have the same factual situation before it as the instant case presents. This Court relied heavily in the *Johnson* case upon the fact that Johnson presented a belated claim for collateral relief on a final judgment, and which final judgment had become final long before the rules were announced in *Miranda* and *Escobedo.* Such is not the case in the instant case. Johnson and his co-defendant, Cassidy, hardly had the standing which petitioners have to raise these constitutional issues as well as the issue of being denied Equal Protection of the law. It therefore is submitted that the *Johnson* case does not present a proper factual situation for a final determination that petitioners who have asserted their constitutional claims under the Fifth and Sixth Amendment just as fully and TIMELY as any other defendant should not have these constitutional claims protected just because of the fortuitous circumstance that another defendant had his case heard by this Court first. Even if this Court were to reject petitioners contention in this regard it should be on a case factually similar to theirs rather than upon the facts of the *Johnson* case and for this reason the writ should be granted.

Finally, even if this Court is not disposed to re-examine the *Johnson* case, limit its holding, or distinguish it from the instant case, the Louisiana Supreme Court committed error prejudicial to the petitioners rights by TOTALLY rejecting the *Miranda* decision. This is in spite of an admonition by this Court in the *Johnson* case that the *Miranda* decision has limited application as part of the involuntariness claim.

The Louisiana Supreme Court summarily shut out any and all consideration of anything said by this Court in *Miranda* with a brief quotation from the Johnson case and then with these cryptic words:

> "We find that the ruling of the trial judge was correct. As stated *supra*, this case was tried and concluded during 1965, at which time *Miranda supra*, had not been decided. *Escobedo* applies. See *State v. Johnson*, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 137; *State v. Carter*, 248 La. 730, 181 So. 2d 763." 203 So. 2d 242.

Such language as quoted above shows almost disregard for the language of this Court in *Johnson v. New Jersey*, wherein it was stated:

> "Thus while Escobedo and Miranda provide important new safeguards against the use of unreliable statements at trial, the non-retroactivity of these decisions will not preclude persons whose trial have ALREADY BEEN COMPLETED from invoking the SAME SAFEGUARDS as part of an involuntariness claim." 384 U.S. at 730; 86 S. Ct. at 1779.

In view of the above language, there appears to be no justification to totally disregard the safeguards of the *Miranda* case as was done to petitioners. To be sure that this Court intended that *Miranda* safeguards and standards be taken into account on involuntariness claim, the above mandate

was buttressed with the following language and authority quoted in the *Johnson* case:

> "Prisoners may invoke a substantive test of voluntariness which, because of the persistence of abusive practices, has become increasingly meticulous through the years. See *Reck v. Pate*, 367 U.S. 433 (1961). That test now takes specific account of the failure to advise the accused of his privilege against self-incrimination or to allow him access to outside assistance. See *Haynes v. Washington*, 373 U.S. 503 (1963); *Spano v. New York*, 360 U.S. 315 (1959)."
>
> * * * * *
>
> "We have pointed out above that past decisions treated the failure to warn accused persons of their rights, or the failure to grant them access to outside assistance, as factors tending to prove the involuntariness of the resulting confessions. See *Haynes v. Washington, supra; Spano v. New York, supra.*"

Petitioners, therefore, have had their confessions judged by standards that do not comport to constitutional guarantees both as to the *Miranda* type of warning under the Fifth and Sixth Amendment and as to constitutional standards required to determine an involuntariness claim. Whether their claim of Equal Protection be sustained or not they are entitled to have the Louisiana Supreme Court judge the issue of voluntariness by consideration of the principals set out in *Miranda* as they have been so admonished in the *Johnson* case.

Part V. Cumulative Error

Each of the reasons advanced in Parts I, II, III, and IV for granting the writ are urged to individually and separately be sufficient grounds for granting of the writ

and reversal of petitioners' convictions. Additionally and alternatively these reasons are cumulatively and collectively advanced as creating a totality of circumstances under which it cannot be said that petitioners received a fair trial consistent with due process of law as required by the Fourteenth Amendment. Those reasons are incorporated by reference.

Particularly prejudicial to petitioners was the photographic color slides of the autopsy which because of a defense stipulation as to the cause of death were not material and had no probative effect except to inflame the jury.

The second witness called by the State in the trial of this case was Dr. John B. Maxwell, the pathologist who made the autopsy of the deceased at the request of the Avoyelles Parish Coroner. After Dr. Maxwell had been sworn, but before he answered the first question on direct examination, counsel for defendants stated the following:

> "Defense wishes to stipulate that Ralph Beeson died in the early morning hours of April 19, 1964; that his death resulted from trauma to the brain, incidental to and attendant to a basal fracture of the skull. Defendants wish to admit this for the record, Your Honor."

Subsequently, the State offered in evidence color slides identified as State Trial Exhibits 1-TB through and including 6-TB, which were a full face view of the deceased Beeson, the right side of the head of the deceased, the left side of the head of the deceased, the under side of the brain of the deceased, the floor of the skull of the deceased, and both lungs of the said deceased. These color slides were made by Dr. Maxwell during the course of his autopsy. When these color slides were offered in evidence, the defendants objected on the following grounds:

1) The proper foundation for their introduction had not been laid;

2) There was no predicate yet established that would permit the purported offerings to be received in evidence;

3) They were taken at a time too remote at the time to be relevant or material or of any probative value;

4) That they were not necessary or material to any issue or fact involved in this case at this time;

5) That they were gruesome, ghastly, shocking, emotional disturbing and would be prejudicial if received in evidence and viewed by the jury to the rights of the defendants;

6) That there is no dispute at this time as to the cause of death, there having been a stipulation prior to the testimony of Dr. Maxwell as to the cause of death (it was also stipulated 'we will stipulate further that the cause of death was as related by Dr. Maxwell in response to the interrogation of him by **defense counsel**").

7) That the autopsy and what is revealed thereby was not the handiwork of either of these two defendants but the handiwork and a professional handiwork as the result of Dr. Maxwell.

8) That there was no probative value that could be attached to the offerings; and also in addition to these objections is the contention by the defendants that the basis of the statement made by the District Attorney in his opening statement of the evidence that he proposed to introduce and will seek to introduce, that these slides are not the best evidence, that the District Attorney in his opening statement said "that there were photographs made of the deceased at the funeral home, that the body of the deceased was examined at the funeral home by Dr. Kaufman."

The Court overruled these objections made by the defendants and allowed the Exhibits referred to above to be admitted and filed in evidence and this Bill of Exception was reversed.

The stipulation which is quoted in the Bill of Exception, and the principles of law which we will hereinafter state, should make it crystal clear that the Court's ruling admitting these color slides in evidence and to be viewed by the Jury constituted prejudicial error.

The color slides to which we have reference and the photographs produced therefrom were taken approximately 7 to 8 hours after Beeson's death and accordingly could not be considered as res gestae.

The Coroner and Dr. Maxwell, a Pathologist, testified at length as to the cause of death. Accordingly, it cannot be said that the color slides and their counterpart photographs had any probative value.

In 23 *C.J.S. Sec. 851* (1) p. 352, the rule is stated as follows:

> "Where photographs are otherwise properly admitted, it is not a valid objection to their admissibility that they tend to prejudice the Jury, as in the case of photographs of the victim's body or wounds, or that the scene of the crime; but **the test of admissibility in such cases is whether the probative value of the photographs outweighed their probable prejudicial effect.**" (Emphasis added.).

18 *La. Law Review* 139 the following comment is made:

> "In *State vs. Morgan* (30 So. 2d 434) the Supreme Court indicated that gruesome photographs of the

deceased victim in a criminal case should be excluded if they have little or **no probative value,** and involve a **substantial risk of undue prejudice.** Although the writer feels that the approach taken in the *Morgan* case is sound, it must be recognized that subsequent cases have whittled away its persuasiveness as authority."

Further, on the above cited comment, the writer states:

"The process suggested by the *Morgan* case of balancing the probative value of the photographs against the risk of undue prejudice seems to be an appropriate one, and it is hoped that the theory underlying the *Morgan* case will not be abandoned."

In 1963, the Louisiana Supreme Court decided *State vs. Morris,* 157 So. 2d 728. In view of the similarity of facts in *Morris* and the instant case, we beg the indulgence of the Court in quoting at length therefrom:

"The Fourth Bill was taken to the admission into evidence and their projection on the screen of 15 photographic **color slides** which showed the body of the deceased immediately **prior to and while undergoing an autopsy.** Before their introduction, the State without objection from defendant had offered and filed 2 black and white photographs of decedent's body which clearly disclosed the 5 bullet wounds and their location (4 were in the abdomen and 1 in the right leg). Furthermore, **the Coroner had already testified very definitely that death resulted from the gunshot wounds** in the abdomen and hence **its cause was not a contested issue.** In fact, in an opening statement defense counsel had declared to the Jury that the 'Killing' had resulted in the manner related by the District Attorney. A full confession also had been introduced without objection. The sole issue in the case then was whether the killing was intentional or whether it was done in the heat of passion, the defense con-

tending for the latter and asking for penalty less than the death sentence. (Emphasis added).

"Most of the photographic color slides are indeed gruesome and ghastly. The first two were virtually a reproduction in color of the previously introduced black and white pictures. They are merely cumulative and not particularly objectionable. The third was taken while looking at the body from the head downward upon the commencement of the autopsy. However, the fourth and fifth show the lengthy incision of the autopsy, and laying bare of the inner portion of the body, and the suction apparatus evacuating some of the bloody contents of the body cavity. The remaining pictures are increasingly grotesque and revolting. In many of them the hands of the coroner and his assistant are shown holding various organs within the bloody opening."

The Louisiana Supreme Court then went on to discuss the general rule and the exception to the rule:

"Particularly applicable to the instant case are the following observations of the Oklahoma Court in *Oxendine vs. State, supra:* 'It is apparent from the cases heretofore cited that if the pictures of a homicide victim made subsequent to his death are gruesome or ghastly, and carry danger or prejudice, they are **inadmissible unless they are relevant to some material issue** and would reasonably assist the jury in the determination of the defendant's guilt, and **this relevancy must outweigh the danger that the Jury would substitute** emotion for reason as the basis of their verdict.'" (Emphasis added).

"In the case at Bar there was no reason for the introduction of the color slides. **There was no issue nor controversy as to the cause of death.** The defendant admitted the crime in intricate detail. The photos could not possibly lend assistance in the determination of the defendants' guilt. It was admitted. Had there been a conflict as to the shooting

or cause of death or location of the wounds or an issue to which the photos were relevant, then and in that event, they would have been admissible had they have been prior to the performance of the autopsy. But the autopsy was not the handiwork of the defendant **and could under the circumstances serve no other purpose than to arouse the emotions and passion of the Jury.** This Court feels that the photos were wholly inadmissible in the form presented and their admission was an abuse of the Trial Court's discretion. If the photographs had been limited to the area showing the points of entrance and possible egress of the bullets without showing the gruesome incisions incident to the autopsy, the action of the Court in the admission of such cumulative evidence could not be held to be reversible error, but the pictures of the nude body of the young woman showing the stated visual results of the autopsy could not help but shock the viewer. **The whole procedure seems to have been so unnecessary and was highly prejudicial and forces a reversal."** (Emphasis added).

In commenting on the decision in *Morris, supra*, it is stated in 25 La. Law Review, 162:

"The color slides were irrelevant since they did not tend to be probative of the proposition at which they were directed, the **cause of death.** A lay Jury was incapable of determining whether the organs were diseased. Even if the pictures had been probative of the cause of death, they would have been excluded on the theory that the **cause of death was not at issue.** The killing was an admitted fact. Relevant evidence—an appelation certainly not applicable to the 15 color slides presented in *State vs. Morris*—is admissible if the probative value is not outweighed by the dangers of the undue prejudice, abstraction and waste of time. After arguing relevancy, the State contended that if the pictures were irrelevant the defendant was not prejudiced. How-

> ever, the Supreme Court, after viewing the slides, held the pictures were inherntly prejudicial because they were 'in such form as to be highly shocking and emotionally disturbing to the mind of an average individual.'" (Emphasis added).

Even standing alone the defendant was denied substantial rights by the permitting of the jury to view as evidence outside of the presence of defendants the jail in which they had been incarcerated. In Louisiana, the jurisprudence has laid down the rule that a defendant who is on trial for a felony must be present in court during every important stage of the trial. *State vs. Layton*, 158 So. 375; *State vs. Futrell*, 106 So. 651; *State vs. Christian*, 30 La. Ann. 567.

In *Louisiana Law Review*, Volume 4 at page 622, it is stated:

> "The various jurisdictions are in conflict as to the necessity or even the right of the accused to be present at the viewing of the scene of the alleged crime by th Jury. In jurisdictions which consider the view by the Jury as the taking of evidence and an important phase of the trial, the constitutional right of confrontation is violated if the accused is denied the right to be present."

Also in Volume 4 at page 623 it is stated:

> "In Louisiana, viewing the scene of the alleged crime is uniformly considered **as taking evidence;** therefore, the accused has a constitutional right to attend and it is an error to deny him this right. Failure to file a timely objection has been held not to prevent the accused from raising an error on appeal. However, where the accused was present at the viewing and voluntarily remained out of the sight of the Jury without objecting to this irregu-

larity and could show no injury or prejudice, he could not later raise the error."

It is respectfully submitted that inasmuch as this was a capital case and the constitutional right of the accused was involved, his right to be present when the Jury viewed a truck outside the Courthouse and when the Jury viewed the toilet facilities in the Avoyelles Parish Jail could not be waived by his counsel.

Even if it is concluded that defendants could "waive" this right, it is respectfully submitted that there was no waiver in the instant case for the reason that neither of the defendants declined to accept the privilege and as a matter of fact when the Jury viewed the toilet facilities in the Jail, their counsel was not aware of their absence for the reason that in the confusion and crowd that went to the Jail, their absence was unnoticed.

The accused in a criminal prosecution in which a view of the place where the crime was committed is ordered is deemed to have waived his right to be present when the view is taken, where the Court expressly grants him permission to accompany the Jury, and **he declines to accept the privilege.** See *Kanner vs. United States*, 34 F. 2d 863.

In *State vs. Pepper*, 180 So. 642, the Louisiana Supreme Court reversed the conviction of the accused who was not present at a view by the jury, and held that the right of the accused to be present could not be waived by counsel, and that any waiver must be by the **accused** himself. It was further held that **waiver by the accused** must be shown by the court **minutes**; a showing of waiver by the counsel for accused in the court's per curiam or minutes is not enough.

In *14 American Jurisprudence*, "Criminal Law" Sec-

tion 196, the rule relative to the right of the accused to be present at a view by the Jury is set forth and Section 199 is devoted to discussion of the "waiver of right" of the accused to be present. In the latter section of the authority cited, it is said:

> "There is a direct conflict among the authorities as to whether one accused of crime can waive his right to be present at the trial. According to the prevailing view, if the felony **is not capital** and the accused being at large on bail, is present at the beginning of the trial but thereafter voluntarily absents himself or being in custody makes his escape from the jurisdiction, the Court has a right to proceed with the trial to its completion and the absence of the defendant operates as a waiver of his constitutional right to be present at every stage of the trial. In **a few jurisdictions** the accused may waive his right to be present even in **capital cases.** Sometime some statutory authority to waive the right exists." (Emphasis supplied).

It is further stated in 14 American Jurisprudence, "Criminal Law" Section 200, at Page 907 that:

> "As a general rule, counsel cannot waive the right of the accused to be present."

Ordinarily there might be no significance attached to the absence of the accused at the viewing of a scene such as involved in this case; however, the importance of their absence was brought into sharp focus in this case by reason of the remarks made by the District Attorney in his closing-rebuttal argument and which have been quoted hereinabove.

Petitioners have seriously contended and still contend that each individual error complained of has standing alone denied them certain fundamental constitutional rights. But even if it were to be held by this Court that such is

not the case, then petitioners contend that they are entitled to have the totality of the circumstances of the trial and cumulation of errors weighed in order to determine whether their constitutional rights have been violated. Petitioners urge that a microscopic examination of each individual error complained of by a state court, without regard to the overall effect of the multiplication of a magnitude of errors compounded each upon the other, cannot be dispatched by the mere recitation that as to each individual error defendants have not shown that they are prejudiced. Such a course might be likened to not seeing the forest for the trees.

It is submitted that this Court, while hesitating to impose its McNabb-Mallory Rule upon the states directly, has on occasions when reviewing confessions looked to the **totality of the circumstances** to determine their voluntary and legal character and, in fact, excluded confessions on such ground. See *Fikes v. Alabama*, 352 U.S. 191, 77 S. Ct. 281, (1957); *Culombe v. Connecticut*, 867 U.S. 503, 83 S. Ct. 1960 (1961); *Haynes v. Washington*, 373 U.S. 503, 83 S. Ct. 1336 (1963). Similarly, this Court, against the contention that a pre-*Mapp v. Ohio* admission of illegally obtained evidence constituted in that case harmless error, rejected the contention and stated it could not "ignore the **cumulative prejudicial effect of this evidence** upon the conduct of the defense of this trial." *Fahy v. Connecticut*, 375 U.S. 89, 91, 84 S. Ct. 229, 232 (1963).

The courts below never determined upon the evidence as a whole and in its entirety that the defendants had a fair trial, but rather they determined or concluded that as to each error the courts did not find prejudice to the defendants. This is not the same thing as to hold that the totality of the circumstances showed that the defendants

had a fair trial consistent with their constitutional guarantee.

To treat each error piecemeal and individually in a trial is to treat it like a grain of sand or drop of water out of its natural habitat. But it must be remembered:

> Little drops of water, little grains of sand,
> Make the mighty ocean, and this pleasant land.

Only by applying a "totality of circumstances" test and theory of prejudice from cumulative error can a realistic determination be made as to whether the petitioners received a **fair trial** as they are entitled to under the due process of law.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the decision of the Court below is erroneous. For the individual reasons assigned in Parts I, II, III, and IV, and, alternatively and additionally, under a totality of circumstances test and a theory of cumulative prejudice from errors, the present petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

CAMILLE F. GRAVEL, JR.,
611 Murray Street,
Alexandria, Louisiana 71301,
Attorney for Defendants-Petitioners.

BY_____
CAMILLE F. GRAVEL, JR.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing application has been served upon the opposing counsel: Jack P. F. Gremillion, Attorney General, State of Louisiana, State Capitol, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; William P. Schuler, Second Assistant Attorney General; Harry H. Howard, Assistant Attorney General, 104 Supreme Court Building, New Orleans, Louisiana, by placing same in the United States Mail, properly addressed, with sufficient postage affixed thereto.

Alexandria, Louisiana, April ....., 1968.

CAMILLE F. GRAVEL, JR.

APPENDIX "A"

---

251 La. 77

STATE OF LOUISIANA

v.

JOHN T. HOPPER and JOE A. WOODARD

No. 48,170

Supreme Court of Louisiana

June 5, 1967

Rehearing Denied Nov. 6, 1967

HAMLIN, Justice:

John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard, defendants, were jointly indicted for the crime of murder (LSA-R.S. 14:30) of Joseph Ralph Beeson. They were tried, found guilty of "Manslaughter," and sentenced to serve fifty-nine (59) months at hard labor in the Louisiana State Penitentiary. On appeal to this Court, they present for consideration fifty-three bills of exceptions.

Bill of Exception No. 1 was reserved when the trial court overruled defendants' objection to the association of Chris J. Roy (allegedly the brother of District Attorney Anthony J. Roy, Jr.) in the prosecution of this case. Herein, counsel for defendants argue that there was no authority for the association, and that LSA-R.S. 15:17 is unconstitutional insofar as it provides a method of appointment of assistant district attorneys different to that set forth in Art. VII, Sec. 60, La. Const. of 1921.

Sec. 60 of Art. VII, La. Const. of 1921, provides:

"In each judicial district, the Legislature shall have the power to create and provide one or more

assistant district attorneys, said assistant district attorney to be selected and appointed by the district attorney of said judicial district, subject to removal at his discretion, and commissioned by the Governor."

LSA-R.S. 15:17 provided:[1]

"Subject to the supervision of the attorney-general, as hereinafter provided, the district attorney shall have entire charge and control of every criminal prosecution instituted or pending in any parish wherein he is district attorney, and shall determine whom, when, and how he shall prosecute; provided, that every district attorney shall have the right to employ or to accept the assistance in the conduct of any criminal case of such counsel as to him may seem fit."

We find no conflict between LSA-R.S. 15:17 and Art. VII, Sec. 60, La. Const. of 1921. LSA-R.S. 15:17 is merely a legislative enactment carrying into effect the constitutional provision. The jurisprudence has been legion that private counsel may be employed to assist the Attorney General or the district attorney in the trial of a criminal cause. State v. Petrich, 122 La. 127, 47 So. 438; State ex rel. Stewart v. Reid, 113 La. 890, 37 So. 866; State v. Mack, 45 La. Ann. 1155, 14 So. 141. Defendants have not shown prejudice.

Bill of Exceptions No. 1 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 2 was reserved when the trial judge sustained the objection of the district attorney to being questioned on cross-examination during the hearing of the Motion to Suppress Evidence.

---

[1] Art. 63 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure, which has replaced LSA-R.S. 15:17 in part, provides:—"The district attorney may employ or accept the assistance of other counsel in the conduct of a criminal case."

Prior to the trial judge's ruling, counsel for defendants asked the district attorney the following question after having called him under cross-examination:

> "And in that connection as District Attorney was there brought to your attention on April 19th., 1964 [the day the instant crime is alleged to have been committed] any information regarding an occurrence out at the Pelican Club here in Marksville that resulted in the death of the young Beeson boy?"

After responding affirmatively to this question, the district attorney was asked at what time the information was brought to his attention. He then said:

> "Judge, at this stage I'd like to say this and make this objection.
>
> "First of all I wish that this tragedy had never occurred.
>
> "Secondly, that I have a job to perform here and this is an adverse proceeding and I don't feel that counsel for the defense has a right to cross examine me, there is no such procedure, as District Attorney and I feel that there will be a time in this case when I will perhaps have to take the stand and until such time I would—at that time I would be subject to cross examination. Until that time does arrive, I object to being questioned as to what occurred or any of my notes or information that I may possess as District Attorney because in effect the District Attorney is the State's (inaudible) in any criminal case. For those reasons I object to being called under cross examination at this time."

In sustaining the objection of the district attorney, the trial judge stated that counsel for defendants had other avenues to determine all of the facts and circumstances that had any bearing upon the statements that were made

(allegedly by defendants) and were being sought to be suppressed. The court said that those avenues would not subject the district attorney to reveal information. The court felt that the information received by the district attorney and the information in his possession as well as what prompted him to act were perhaps based upon confidential information that the district attorney had a right to refuse to divulge.

Herein, counsel for defendants argue that they were not attempting to get the district attorney to divulge any secret information or evidence he had in his files. They contend that the trial court committed prejudicial error to the rights of the accused; they argue that since the district attorney freely and frequently took the witness stand during the trial if the case before the jury, he should not have been averse to taking it on the hearing of the Motion to Suppress Evidence. Finally, counsel contend that the action of the district attorney was not consonant with the basic concept of a "fair and impartial" trial, his attitude not being that prescribed in State v. Tate, 185 La. 1006, 171 So. 108:

> "The district attorney is a quasi judicial officer. He represents the State, and the State demands no victims. It seeks justice only, equal and impartial justice, and it is as much the duty of the district attorney to see that no innocent man suffers as it is to see that no guilty man escapes. * * * Therefore he should not be involved or interested in any extrinsic matters which might, consciously or unconsciously, impair or destroy his power to conduct the accused's trial fairly and impartially."

Under the circumstances existing at the time this bill was reserved, we do not find that the constitutional rights

of the defendants were violated. Likewise, we do not find that the trial judge abused his discretion in ruling as he did. No Louisiana authority holding that a district attorney must testify under cross-examination on the hearing of a Motion to Suppress Evidence has been pointed out to us. Our research reveals none. Defendants have not shown prejudice. Therefore, we conclude that the defendants were not prejudiced and suffered no deprivation of rights afforded at a "fair and impartial" trial.

Bill of Exceptions No. 2 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 3 was reserved when the trial judge permitted Trooper Carl Clifford Slaughter of the Louisiana State Police to answer the following question:

> "Trooper, would you answer the question as to whether you could hear traffic between the various Avoyelles Parish units, the mobile units, and also the main station here in the Sheriffs office, regarding the incident and killing at the Pelican Club?"

Trooper Slaughter's answer was in the affirmative.

Counsel for defendants contend that the trial court was in error in permitting this witness to testify as to what he heard over the radio when he was not a party to the communication. It is contended that his testimony was hearsay.

A reading of the entire testimony of this witness reflects that the testimony was technical in great part; he described the radio operations at his communications center. Trooper Slaughter was on duty as the radio operator in Troop E headquarters in Alexandria, Louisiana, from midnight April 19, 1964 until sometime later in the morning; Troop E has jurisdiction over Avoyelles, Ra-

pides, Natchitoches, Winn, Grant, LaSalle, Concordia and Catahoula Parishes.

Because of the seriousness of the instant occurrence, there were many radio communications concerning it. Defendants suffered no prejudice from Trooper Slaughter's affirmative answer. Defendants have shown no prejudice. We find that the testimony objected to was only incidental to the entire testimony.

Bill of Exceptions No. 3 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 4 was reserved when the trial judge permitted certain witnesses to answer allegedly improper questions propounded to them during the pre-trial proceedings on the Motion to Suppress Evidence.[2]

---

[2] The following allegations are from Bill of Exceptions No. 4:

"1. While Dr. Henry Kaufman, the Coroner, was on the witness stand, the Court permitted the District Attorney to ask witness, 'Did defendant, John Hopper, appear to be afraid at that time?' (reference being made to the time Coroner was taking an incriminating statement from the accused Hopper). This question was objected to on the ground that it called for an opinion as to the state of mind of the defendant, to which an objection was made and overruled and a Bill reserved.

"2. While Chief of Police Paul Dubea was on the witness stand, the District Attorney on direct examination asked him: 'Did Mr. Woodard say whether the statement was true or correct?' (referring to the alleged statement made by the defendant Woodard). Objection was made on the ground that it was leading and suggestive of an answer. The Court overruled the objection and defendants, through counsel, reserved a Bill of Exceptions.

"3. While Chief of Police Dubea was being examined by the District Attorney, he was asked: 'Chief Dubea, do you recall if Major Henderson would have asked Mr. Hopper (defendant) if the notes that he showed him (alleged statement of the accused) were true and correct?'. Question was objected to on the grounds that it was leading. Objection was overruled and a Bill of Exception was reserved.

"4. While the District Attorney was examining Chief of Police Dubea in the presence of the jury, the District Attorney asked him: 'Was the defendant then asked by Major Henderson if the contents were true and correct?'. Objection was made on the ground that the question was leading. The Court overruled the objection and a Bill of Exception was reserved.

"5. While Gary Morrison, a witness for the State, was

(Continued)

Counsel contend that the answers of the witnesses prejudiced the rights of the defendants, and that the cumulation of such errors impeached the fair and impartial character of the proceedings. State v. Henry, 196 La. 217, 198 So. 910.

We find that the testimony objected to was relevant to the Motion to Suppress Evidence. It was therefore not cumulatively erroneous. Defendants have not shown, and we do not find that defendants suffered prejudice from the admission of the testimony. The rules of fairness and impartiality were not violated.

Bill of Exceptions No. 4 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 5 was reserved when the trial judge overruled defendants' Motion to Suppress Evidence. The motion sought to have excluded from the evidence the

---

[2] (Continued)
being examined by the District Attorney, the witness was asked the following question: 'Did you see either or both of these defendants lay a hand or any object on the deceased?'. To which the witness answered, 'Yes, I had'. Then the District Attorney asked him, 'What had they done to Ralph Beeson?'. At this point defendants, through counsel, objected on the ground that the question was repetitious; that the witness had already testified as to what he saw and what occurred there. Still further on in the questioning the District Attorney asked this witness, 'Mr. Morrison, are you in a position to tell the jury how many of the kicks or blows you saw made by the defendant Joe Woodard or John Hopper actually hit the body of Ralph Beeson?' To which question defendants, through counsel, objected on the ground that it was repetitious, the objection was overruled, and a Bill of Exception reserved.

"6. While Gary Morrison was testifying on behalf of the State, the District Attorney asked him if the truck that he saw on the occasion of April 19, 1964, at the Pelican Club appeared similar to the type truck shown in a picture which the District Attorney displayed to the witness. Objection was made on the ground that the picture, which was unmarked and not identified, had already been presented to the witness and that the District Attorney was leading the witness, not only by questions but by presentation to the witness of an unidentified piece of paper on which there is on one side one kind of vehicle and on the other side several kinds of vehicles. The objection was overruled by the Court and a Bill of Exception was reserved, and the document marked 'State Trial No. 9' made part of the Bill."

following unsigned oral statements given to Major Harold J. Henderson, Chief Deputy in the Sheriff's Office of Avoyelles Parish, shortly after the apprehension and arrest of the defendants:[3]

"Statement given to Deputy Henderson on above date at 4:AM with reference to altercation at Pelican Club in Marksville on night of 4/19/64 at approximately 1:30 A.M.

"My name is Joe Woodard. I am 20 years of age and live at Delhi La. I attend school at La Tech in Ruston La. We left Ruston yesterday P.M. at about 4:00 P.M. in my car (1963 Corvair) in Route to Marksville to the Pelican Club. John Hopper, Billy Frazer and Charlie Gaharae were in the car with me. We arrived in Marksville about 8 PM last night and got a room at the Ranch House Motel. Then we went to the Pelican Club. We got there between 8:00 and 8:30 P.M. Upon arriving I drank maybe two beers. I don't know what the other boys had to drink while I drank the beer. Then Billy Johnny and I went together and bought a 5th of whiskey. We sat at a table with five of my friends from La. Tech and drank the 5th of whiskey.

"There were 4 or 5 girls sitting at the table near ours. Me and Charlie Gaharae were dancing with 2 of the girls, Maria & Eunice. I don't know their last name.

"While Charlie and myself were talking and dancing with the two girls, Billy and John took the whiskey from our table and took it to the table where Jimmy Nobles and his wife were sitting. When I wanted a drink I would walk over to Jimmy's table and mix a drink and go back dancing. When we finished the 1st 5th it was about 10:30 or

[3] We have copied the statements in their entirety, in order that the reader might have an appreciation of the alleged facts of this case.

11:00 P.M. We then bought another 5th. We first had the 5th on Jimmy's table then Johnny or Billie moved the whiskey to the table where the girls were sitting. Between 12:00 & 12:30 A.M Maria and Eunice left to go home then I went to the table where John, Billy and the girls were sitting. The boy that died and 1 or 2 more were sitting at the same table. I was there just a few minutes when an argument started about some whiskey. Jimmy accused the boy that died of taking some whiskey from his table. When Jimmy came over to the table where Johnny, Billie, Charlie and I and 4 girls (I don't know the girls) the boy that died was sitting there also. Jimmy and the deceased boy had a few words. Jimmy saw the empty 1/2 bottle on the floor near the feet of the deceased which he said was his (Jimmy's).

"Then Jimmy and the deceased had a few words then Jimmy took a half pint of rum and went back to the table where his (Jimmy's) wife was sitting. Johnny saw the deceased pour himself a drink from the 2nd 5th we had bought. He told him not to be drinking out of his whiskey. It was 5 or 10 minutes after 1:00 AM. Johnny danced a couple of times. When he came back to the table the deceased was pouring another drink. Johnny got mad when he saw that. By the way they were acting I thought they were going out side to fight. They left where they were and started out side. They had taken a few steps when Billy and myself and two boys who were with the deceased followed them out side the club. We all went thru the front door. Johnny and the deceased were walking ahead of myself, Billy Frazier and two other boys. We paused at the corner and Johnny and the deceased walked by the building where a Red Panel Truck was parked. They were standing by the truck arguing like they were going to fight. The boys who were

with me stopped and I went to where Johnny and the deceased were arguing.

"Just before I got there the deceased hit Johnny on the side of the head with a glass. I then ran up and grabbed the deceased. I was holding him and Johnny hit him once or twice while he was standing up. We then pushed him down between the concrete slab and the Truck. Then we both hit him 4 or 5 times each while he was down. Most of the blows land on the head. I then kicked him on the side of the head. Johnny hit him a couple of times on the head after I kicked him. Then we saw a whole lot of blood on the concrete slab. The slab is on the East side of the Building about half way to the back.

"When Johnny and I saw the blood we ran back to the front of the club where the car was parked. About that time Jimmy and Charlie were coming out the front. Billy had the bottle of whiskey which he gave to Johnny then he ran and got Charlie then we all 4 got in the car and left. We went to the Ranch House Motel where we washed the blood off of Johnny. Two officers from Marksville came and picked us up. The blood washed off Johnny's head was caused by a cut on the ear when he was hit by the deceased.

"Page 1-2-3-4 was given voluntarily by Joe Woodard who admitted before Deputy Hebert Bordelon and Police Chief Paul Dubea that statement was given without threat—duress or promises.

"H. Henderson
"Chief Paul Dubea
"Dpy. Hebert J. Bordelon"

"Statement given to Dr. Henry Kaufman, Chief Paul Dubea and Deputy Harold Henderson on above date at 6:00 o'clock A.M. with reference

to altercation at Pelican Club in which Joseph Ralph Beeson was killed.

"By name is John Towne Hopper. I and 21 years of age and live at Delhi La. I attend college at La. Tech in Ruston, La. We, Billy Frazier, Joe Woodard, Charlie Gaharae and myself left Ruston about 4:00 P.M. Sat 18th and came to Marksville. We got here a little before 8:00 PM and got a room at the Ranch House Motel. We then left the motel and went to the Pelican Club arriving about 15 or 20 minutes past eight. I'm not sure of the time. When he got to the Club we met some boys we knew from Tech. Then we all started drinking whiskey. When we first got there we bought a 5th of whiskey. Me, Joe, Charlie and Frazier and some more boys from Tech were sitting at one table. I danced one time. I don't know the girl's name I danced with.

"After a while another boy from Tech came to our table. His name was Jimmy Nobles who said he had his wife with him. We talked to Jimmy a little bit then he invited me to the table where his wife was. I talked to them a while then Joe came up. Jimmy told us to bring our whiskey and sit with them. Dave Parrot and his wife were with the Nobles at the table. After we talked to the Nobles a while I went back to my table. I don't know if Joe walked back with me or not, but when I got back to our table Joe was there. We rummaged around talking and drinking. Joe and I decided we would take our bottle of whiskey (a 5th) and go back to Jimmy's table. We talked a while at Jimmy's table. There were some girls at another table. One of the girls name was Jeanie Levergne. I don't know the other girls' names. I danced with Jeanie 1 or 2 times. I was drinking whiskey while we talked and danced. I would go back and forth between the two tables—the girls table and the Nobles table. That went on til the band took a break around midnight.

"During the break I just milled around and went back to the table where some of the boys I knew were. Later on about 20 or 30 minutes the band started playing. I told Joe and Frazer Lets get another 5th. Frazer and I went to get the whiskey ice and cokes. We took the 5th and put it on Nobles table.

"I fixed myself a drink and walked over to the girls table with the drink in my hand. Jeanie and myself would go out and dance then come back and sit down. We danced a couple of times and I was out of a drink. I then went over to Nobles' table to get a drink. I picked up the whiskey and coke and took them back to the girls table. I asked the girls if they wanted to drink and they said no so I mixed me another drink. We would dance some and when we come back to the table my drink would be missing. It happened 1 or 2 times then I would get a glass and mix another one. Right along then I was getting pretty drunk. I guess. I don't know what time it was when the 4 girls said they were leaving.

"I walked up front with them talking and Jean told me her name was Jean Levergne and she worked in Baton Rouge. They left and I walked back to the table where my whiskey was. Joe was at the table when I got there and I think Nobles was there. I don't remember when he came. Nobles said he was missing some whiskey. There was two other boys at the table there where my whiskey was. Then we all got ready to go. Then those two boys got up.. I don't know who they were. We were all leaving the club. One of the boys started talking as we walked out. We were leaning on one another. I mean the boy who turned out to be Beeson We kept walking toward the out side and when we got outside I asked him if he had been getting any whiskey off the table. We stopped walking and

started facing each other. I then heard some one coming up from behind. I turned around to see who it was then Beeson hit me on the left side of my head with a glass or bottle. I don't know what it was. I automatically turned and started hitting him.

"I don't know what all happen. I remember hitting him after he hit me with the glass. The next thing I remember he was down and I was hitting him in the face with my fist. When I got up Joe jumped back. I then said let's go get in the car and get out of here. Then when we got in the car we saw Frazer. We said get Charlie and let's go. We then picked up Charlie and Frazer in front of the club. We finally got back to the Ranch House Motel. I went in the bath room to stop the bleeding of my ear. I had blood on my shirt, chest and neck. Jimmy Nobles and wife came in the room and Jimmy asked us what happened. We told him we got in a fight with this boy. Then someone knocked on the door. I thought it was the owner so I went in the bath room so he wouldn't see the blood. Then I heard talking and thought it was the officers so I got in a closet because I was scared. After every body left I went and layed on the bed. In about 10 minutes the State Police came in and picked me up.

"John Hopper agreed that statement is correct and that said statement was given without threat or duress or promises but refused to sign.

"Chief Paul Dubea
"Henry J. Kaufman, Jr."

Counsel for the defendants contend that the rights and immunities of the defendants were violated as follows:

"1. Any statement purportedly made by them was during and subsequent to their arrest, which was illegal and in violation of their rights under

the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, said arrest being without 'probable cause.'

"2. Any such statement was not given by either of the defendants freely and voluntarily, and in the securing of same, their rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and Article 1, Section 2 and Article 1, Section 11, of the Louisiana Constitution were violated by those securing any such statement.

"3. Any such statement was secured while the defendants were without assistance of counsel; they were denied the right of counsel prior to making any such statement; their counsel was not present at the time of their making any such statement; they were not advised of the consequences that might follow from their making any such statement; they were not advised of their right to have counsel present at the time of making any such statement; they were not advised of their right to remain silent and not to make any statement; all in violation of their constitutional and statutory rights under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 2 of the Louisiana Constitution, and Article 1, Section 9 of the Louisiana Constitution, and Section 142 of the Louisiana Code of Criminal Procedure.

"4. They were not accorded their rights under Sections 80, 81 and 82 of the Louisiana Code of Criminal Procedure."

THE LEGALITY VEL NON OF THE ARREST

On April 19, 1964, Reese McNeal, Deputy Sheriff in Avoyelles Parish and radio operator, was on duty in the radio room of the Sheriff's office. Chief of Police Paul

Dubea of the City of Marksville, who used the radio facilities of the Sheriff's office because of the inadequacy of City facilities at that time, was also in the office. At approximately 1:30 A.M., Chief Dubea answered a telephone call and was told that a truck had run over a boy and to call an ambulance. An ambulance was thereupon dispatched to the Pelican Club.

On arrival at the Pelican Club, Chief Dubea and Officer Pete DeNux were confronted with a crowd of between forty and fifty persons, a number of them allegedly being drunk. Lying on a concrete slab in a puddle of blood was the instant victim, Joseph Ralph Beeson. While mixing in the crowd, Chief Dubea determined that the victim had not been run over; that he had allegedly been beaten. A young women told him that three boys, whom she did not know, had driven off in a white Chevrolet Corvair; she gave him a description of the car and the license number.

We believe that the evidence is replete to the effect that Chief Dubea had sufficient information to indicate that the three boys had fled the scene of the altercation, and that they had driven to the Ranch House Motel.

Chief Dubea and Officer DeNux went to the hospital, and on learning that Beeson was dead they returned to the Sheriff's office where they secured the registration of Woodard's automobile. They then immediately proceeded to the Ranch House Motel. Upon spotting Woodard's car, the license number matching that given by the young woman, they inspected it with a flashlight and discovered blood. Chief Dubea, in full dress uniform, and Officer DeNux walked through a crowd of on-lookers and "looked in one of the apartments there at the Ranch House, they had a crack in the door and I presumed it might have been

the ones that the car belonged to so I went up to the door and I knocked and one of them inside said 'come in' so we did, me and DeNux." (Chief Dubea's testimony, record p. 620.). In the room were three boys and a woman. With respect to his entry, Chief Dubea testified:

> "When I knocked they say come on in, we walked in, I don't know who said come in but anyway we walked in and I says 'Mr. Woodard in this room?' and he says 'that's me', he did he was still in bed. I said 'is that your car outside?' he said 'yes sir' I said 'were you in a fight at the Pelican?' he said 'yes, sir', well I said 'the boy that you all the fight with, he's dead' well he said 'we knew we had give him a good beating but we didn't know we had killed him' I says 'you are under arrest' and one of them says 'what for' and I said 'for murder'. So we come up to the sheriff's office, I brought Woodard, Frazier, what's this other guy's name—this fellow was married, forget his name—had his wife, him and his wife, Nobel, well, we just brought those three. * * *"

Having been arrested, the defendant Joe A. Woodard and his two friends were taken to the Courthouse in the back seat of Chief Dubea's car; they were not handcuffed. They were brought to the Sheriff's office where Major Henderson, the Sheriff, the District Attorney, the Coroner, and Allen Normand were present. Chief Dubea testified that Frazier was pretty highly intoxicated and Woodard wasn't too highly intoxicated. Some short time elapsed before Woodard was interrogated, during which time he remained seated in the Sheriff's office.

Sgt. Patrick Lemoine of the Louisiana State Police, accompanied by Trooper Eddie Bordelon, received a radio bulletin telling him to be on the lookout for the instant

Corvair; they had also received news bulletins with respect to the occurrence at the Pelican Club. The officers concluded some business at the Marksville Hospital, where they were approached by two men who gave them details of the instant offense, and then proceeded to the Ranch House Motel. There they found the defendant John T. Hopper alone and bleeding from his ear; Hopper was concealed in a closet of the room when Woodard and the other two boys (with whom we are not concerned herein) were arrested; Hopper's testimony affirmed this fact. Sgt. Lemoine told Hopper that he was wanted for murder by the City and Parish Officers and placed him under arrest.

Trooper Eddie Bordelon stated that Hopper answered affirmatively to Sgt. Lemoine's question as to whether he had been with the boys who had been picked up by the City Police. Bordelon affirmed that Sgt. Lemoine told Hopper he was under arrest; he also stated that Hopper said, "Oh my God, what have we done."

Hopper was taken to the Sheriff's office, where he was turned over to the deputies and later questioned by Major Henderson; during the interval he was seated with his friends. During the ride to the Courthouse he had been handcuffed, but his handcuffs were removed upon arrival in the Sheriff's office.

On the hearing of the Motion to Suppress Evidence, Hopper answered negatively when asked whether the police officer told him he was acting under any specific authority or that he had any charge against him, or warrant for his arrest—that he was being investigated with a criminal offense.

Woodard testified that Chief Dubea told him that Beeson was dead. He said Chief Dubea told him to come

go with him, but that he did not tell him he was under arrest. He answered negatively when asked whether the Chief said "either in the room or at any time to you that you were under arrest or that you were being investigated in connection with any charge."

James Nobles, who was taken to the Sheriff's office with Woodard, testified that Chief Dubea told him to come on downtown, and that he did not think Chief Dubea told him or anyone else that they were under arrest.

Cyrus William Frazier, Jr., a roommate of Joe Woodard, who was also taken to the Sheriff's office with Woodard, testified that Chief Dubea did not tell the boys anything about placing them under arrest; that he did not mention any charges.

LSA-R.S. 15:60 (now Article 213 of the New Code of Criminal Procedure), in effect at the time of the instant offense, provided:

"Any peace officer may, without a warrant, arrest a person;

"(1) For the commission of any felony or misdemeanor committed in his presence;

"(2) When such person has committed a felony although not in the presence of the officer;

"(3) When a felony in fact has been committed and he has reasonable cause to believe that such person has committed it;

"(4) When he has reasonable cause to believe that a felony has been committed and reasonable cause to believe that such person has committed it;

"(5) When he has received positive information by written, telegraphic or other authoritative

source that another officer holds a warrant for such arrest."

As stated supra, counsel for defendants contend that the arrest of the accused was not lawful, for the reason that it was not based on reasonable cause or probable cause as defined in the jurisprudence. They argue that at the time the accused were arrested there was no reliable information from a creditable person which would lead the police officers to reasonably believe that the accused had committed a crime. They say that the basis of arrest made by Chief Dubea of the defendant Woodard could not even rise to the dignity of a mere conclusion which basis for an arrest was condemned in Aguilar v. State of Texas, 378 U.S. 108, 84 S. Ct. 1509, 12 L. Ed. 2d 723.[4]

In the very recent case of State v. Johnson, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 135, this Court discussed "probable cause" in detail; we find our reasoning in that case applicable here.[5] See, also, State v. Bourg, 248 La. 844, 182 So. 2d

---

[4] Aguilar v. State of Texas involved search and seizure.

[5] "Louisiana's standard is set by the legislature. Article 60 of our Code of Criminal Procedure permits an arrest by a peace officer without a warrant, 'When a felony in fact has been committed and he has reasonable cause to believe that such person has committed it. * * *'

"Reasonable belief—or 'probable cause', as it is termed under the federal standard—to make an arrest without a warrant exists when the facts and circumstances within the arresting officer's knowledge, and of which he has reasonable trustworthy information, are sufficient in themselves to justify a man of average caution in the belief that a felony has been or is being committed. Draper v. United States, 358 U.S. 307, 79 S. Ct. 329, 3 L. Ed. 2d 327 (1959); State v. Green, 244 La. 80, 150 So. 2d 571 (1963); State v. Aias, 243 La. 945, 149 So. 2d 400 (1963); State v. Calascione, 243 La. 993, 149 So. 2d 417 (1963).

"Compliance with these standards is, in the first instance, a substantive determination to be made by the trial court from the facts and circumstances of the case. Ker v. State of California, 374 U.S. 23, 83 S. Ct. 1623, 10 L. Ed. 2d 726 (1963); State v. McIlvaine, 247 La. 747, 174 So. 2d 515 (1965).

"And in determining compliance with these standards it is

(Continued)

510; State v. Aias, 243 La. 946, 149 So. 2d 400. Cf. State v. Green, 244 La. 80, 150 So. 2d 571.

We find that the weight of the evidence supra is to the effect that defendants were told that they were under arrest and were thereafter arrested prior to being taken to the Sheriff's office. The evidence preponderates to the effect that the arresting officers knew that a felony had been committed; they likewise had probable cause, as shown by the evidence supra, to believe that defendants were involved in the commission of such offense. We therefore conclude that defendants were lawfully arrested, and that their constitutional rights were not violated by such arrest.

COUNSEL AND THE RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT

As stated supra, counsel for the defendants contend that the confessions or admissions, supra, purportedly made by defendants could not be said to have been made freely and voluntarily in the light of the totality of the circumstances as revealed by the evidence. They argue, as stated supra, that the constitutional rights, privileges and immunities of the accused, as interpreted by the jurispru-

---

5 (Continued)

not the proof required for conviction which concerns us. Proof required to satisfy the requirement of reasonable belief or probable cause is less and is what the terms imply: probabilities and practical considerations of everyday life on which reasonable men could reasonably be expected to act. Brinegar v. United States, 338 U.S. 160, 69 S. Ct. 1302, 93 L. Ed. 1879 (1949); State v. Bourg, 248 La. 844, 182 So. 2d 510 (1966).

"In such cases, because only factual issues are presented by the contentions, the setting in which the arrests took place becomes a factor of prime importance; facts and circumstances known to the arresting officers from which they might draw conclusions warranted by their training and experience become the focus of our attention with due allowance for the discretion vested in the trial court." State v. Johnson, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 135.

dence of the United States Supreme Court, were unquestionably denied to them.

Harold J. Henderson, Chief Deputy in the Sheriff's office in Avoyelles Parish, interrogated the defendants on the morning of April 19, 1964 and reduced to writing the statements supra. He testified he commenced interrogating Woodard at approximately 4:00 A.M., and that Deputy Hebert Bordelon and Chief Paul Dubea were in the office.[6] Henderson's testimony with respect to what was told Woodard is as follows:

"Q. Did you tell him that he did not have to make a statement?

"A. I asked the District Attorney to bring his rights to him.

"Q. You asked the District Attorney to?

"A. Yes.

"Q. You didn't explain his rights to him at all yourself, did you?

"A. I might have said something—told him what the District Attorney said, but the District Attorney was in there at the time and I asked him to explain to Mr. Woodard his rights.

"Q. But you yourself did not undertake to advise him about any of their legal rights, did you?

"A. Yes.

"Q. What did you tell them?

"A. The District Attorney told Mr. Woodard and I told Mr. Hopper.

"Q. Told him what?

[6] The District Attorney did not sign the statement because he was not in Henderson's office during the entire questioning.

"A. Of his rights.

"Q. Well what did you tell him is what I want to know and what did the District Attorney tell them what did you say and what did he say?

"A. Well, I can't recall, I can tell you in essence of what he said but I can tell you what I said.

"Q. All right, tell us first of all what you say the District Attorney told, we take Woodard first, and tell us what he told him in your presence.

"A. As I recall it he told Mr. Hopper—

"Q. Let's deal with Woodard first.

"A. I mean Mr. Woodard. Pardon me, it was my error. Mr. Woodard I sat down to take a statement or interview Mr. Woodard, and the District Attorney was there and I said—in essence—'before we go any farther, Mr. Roy as District Attorney explain to Mr. Woodard his rights.'

"Q. And what did he say?

"A. He told him that 'you don't have to make a statement if you don't want to and if you make a statement it can be used against you in a Court of law, you are entitled to an attorney' and that's the main things I recall him saying.

"Q. Did he ask them if they wanted to use the telephone to call an attorney?

"A. Not that I recall.

"Q. Did either of you tell them that they had a right to obtain counsel right then and there if they wanted to?

"A. Well no, I figured two intelligent college boys sitting by a telephone after they had that much explained to them they could use their own discre-

tion as to what they wanted to do at the time. I thought we went at length in explaining their rights and especially that they did'nt have to talk or say anything.

"Q. But you didn't tell them that they had a right to immediately get a lawyer and they could call and get a lawyer if they wanted to.

"A. I told them they had a right to get a lawyer, call a lawyer.

"* * *

"Q. Could you tell whether Mr. Woodard appeared to have been drinking, whether he was under the influence of alcohol to any extent?

"A. Well, I would say that he had been—appeared that he had been, but he had sobered up somewhat at the time.

"Q. He wasn't completely sober though was he?

"A. Well, having been the first time I ever saw him I wouldn't know how it affected him to that degree, whether he was—he wasn't incoherent, he responded to conversation and so forth, Mr. Woodard did.

"Q. You said a moment ago you could tell he had been drinking and he had sobered up somewhat. Is that what you meant to say?

"A. Yeah. He wasn't obnoxious or anything, he was calm and cooperative.

"* * *

"Q. Did you or Mr. Roy tell Mr. Woodard what he was charged with or that he had been charged?

"A. I did not.

"Q. Did Mr. Roy tell him?

"A. Not that I recall. I couldn't say.

"Q. You didn't tell him that he had been charged at all or that he was going to be charged or anything of that nature?

"A. No, not prior to that.

"Q. Did either you or Mr. Roy tell him what offense you all were interrogating him about?

"A. Yes.

"Q. What offense did you tell him you were interrogating him about?

"A. I told him we were interrogating him—I didn't say interrogating, but we wanted to find out what happened at the Pelican Club.

"Q. But you didn't mention any offense, anything like murder or manslaughter or negligent homicide or assault and battery, battery, or anything like that did you?

"A. No, I didn't know what it was at the time.

"* * *

"Q. Did either you or Mr. Roy ever tell either —or anybody else to your knowledge, tell either Mr. Woodard or Mr. Hopper that they had the right and privilege of using the telephone or the right and privilege to send a messenger for the purpose of communicating with an attorney or that of communicating with their friends, their relatives, for the purpose of securing an attorney?

"A. No, I just gave them a gist of their rights and had they been illiterates I might have gone into detail but college students, I—

"Q. The reason you didn't go into detail was because they were college students?

"A. Intelligent boys. That no one was taking advantage of them, we tried to make them understand that.

"* * *

"Q. Now getting back to the statement that you got from Mr. Woodard, did you write that out in your own handwriting?

"A. I did.

"* * *

"Q. Now, this statement is not a signed statement is it?

"A. No, it isn't.

"Q. Can you tell me why it was not signed?

"A. I read the statement or notes that I took, I read them back to him and I again advised him of his rights, that you are not required to sign this and he said 'well, I don't want to sign it' I said 'I prefer you didn't sign it.'

"Q. Did he say that there were some things that were wrong in what you read back to him?

"A. When I read it back to him I asked him if in essence that was correct statement, he said yes, but he didn't want to sign it. I told him I prefer that he didn't sign it.

"Q. Why would you prefer that he did not sign it?

"A. Because that wasn't his exact words.

"Q. Is that same thing true insofar as the statement of Hopper is concerned?

"A. Right.

"Q. Neither one of them are their exact words.

"A. That's right.

"* * *

"Q. Are you saying that the only question then that—questions then that you asked them was re-

gard to their names, ages, addresses and then asked them to tell you what happened?

"A. No, I wouldn't confine it to that. No. But they led in conversation, both of them. They were very cooperative and they tried the best they could to tell what happened.

"Q. Did you tell either one of them or anyone tell either one of them in your presence that these statements were being obtained from them to determine whether or not charges would be filed against them?

"A. No, I don't recall telling them that. The only thing I told them that if they did give a statement it could be used against them in a Court of law."

Defendant Hopper was interrogated by Major Henderson following the interrogation of Woodard, his interrogation being concluded before 8:30 A.M., April 19, 1964; Dr. Kaufman, Coroner, and Chief Paul Dubea were present. Henderson testified that Hopper appeared to be more intoxicated than Woodard and had a cut on his ear, but that he did not receive medical treatment before interrogation. Henderson said, "I told Mr. Hopper that he didn't have to give a statement that he didn't have to say anything, that he was entitled to an attorney, then if he did make a statement it could be used against him in a court of law." He also said that he told Hopper practically the same thing that was told to Woodard, and, as stated supra, Hopper refused to sign the statement after it was read back to him.

Defendants' testimony is to the effect that they were not mistreated before or during the interrogation. Their testimony is affirmative to the effect that they were not advised of any of their alleged rights before their inter-

rogation. Woodard said that he was beginning to sober up before interrogation; Hopper stated that he did not feel well. Defendants' testimony is in direct conflict with that of Major Henderson, insofar as the information given them before interrogation is concerned. Their testimony reflects that they had never been in previous trouble; they had never had any association with police interrogation. Both defendants testified that the statements were not correct and they refused to sign them. They affirm Major Henderson with respect to the events that transpired after interrogation. Both defendants testified that after interrogation they were told that they could use the telephone, and they did thereupon call their parents.

Sheriff F. O. Didier testified that he had a brief talk with the defendants before the interrogation; he did not advise them of any of their alleged rights. He said that the defendants were booked with murder on the morning of April 19, 1964.

Dr. Henry J. Kaufman, Jr., Coroner for Avoyelles Parish, testified that he was present throughout the interrogation of Hopper. He said that Major Henderson told Hopper that what he said could be used against him. He confirmed that Hopper said he did not want to sign the statement—"until he was advised for it." However, it was his opinion that Hopper did not deny what was in the statement. As far as he could see, the boys did not appear to be drunk.

Chief Dubea affirmed that he was present at the questioning of Woodard. He indicated that nothing was said to either of the defendants with respect to using the telephone until after his interrogation had been completed. He also indicated that they were not told anything with respect to their alleged right to call a lawyer before inter-

rogation. He affirmed that Major Henderson informed them before interrogation that they did not have to make any statement, and that they did not have to answer any questions at all, having an absolute right not to answer questions; that they were also apprised that what they said would be used against them, and they did not have to sign the statements.

Deputy Hebert Bordelon of the Sheriff's office testified that he recalled that Major Henderson took a statement from Woodard. He said that he thought the District Attorney told Woodard that he had a right to have a lawyer present while he was making his statement. He said he was present when Major Henderson gave Woodard the statement to read and when Woodard refused to sign it; that Woodard was advised by Major Henderson that he did not have to sign it.

The instant crime is alleged to have been committed on April 19, 1964. A true bill was returned by the Avoyelles Parish Grand Jury on May 22, 1964. On February 12, 1965, the trial of this cause was assigned for Monday, March 1, 1965, all preliminary pleadings or motions to be filed on or before February 16, 1965. On February 26, 1965, a motion for continuance filed on behalf of the defendants was granted. The Motion to Suppress Evidence was overruled on June 19, 1965. Trial began on June 21, 1965; the jury rendered its verdict on July 16, 1965, and sentence was imposed on August 19, 1965.

In Escobedo v. State of Illinois, 378 U.S. 478, 84 S. Ct. 1758, 12 L. Ed. 2d 977, (argued April 29, 1964, decided June 22, 1964), the United States Supreme Court held:

> "We hold, therefore, that where, as here, the investigation is no longer a general inquiry into an unsolved crime but has begun to focus on a particu-

lar suspect, the suspect has been taken into police custody, the police carry out a process of interrogations that lends itself to eliciting incriminating statements, *the suspect has requested and been denied an opportunity to consult with his lawyer*, and the police have not effectively warned him of his absolute constitutional right to remain silent, the accused has been denied 'the Assistance of Counsel' in violation of the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution as "made obligatory upon the States by the Fourteenth Amendment.' Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, at 342, 83 S. Ct. 792, at 795, 9 L. Ed. 2d 799 and that no statement elicited by the police during the interrogation may be used against him at a criminal trial." (Emphasis ours.)

On June 13, 1966, the United States Supreme Court rendered its decision in Miranda v. State of Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602, 16 L. Ed. 2d 694, in which it held:

"An individual need not make a pre-interrogation request for a lawyer. While such request affirmatively secures his right to have one, his failure to ask for a lawyer does not constitute a waiver. No effective waiver of the right to counsel during interrogation can be recognized unless specifically made after the warnings we here delineate have been given. * * *

"* * * * * *

"Accordingly we hold that an individual held for interrogation must be clearly informed that he has the right to consult with a lawyer and to have the lawyer with him during interrogation under the system for protecting the privilege we delineate today. As with the warnings of the right to remain silent and that anything stated can be used in evidence against him, this warning is an absolute prerequisite to interrogation. No amount of circumstantial evidence that the person may have been aware of this right will suffice to stand in its stead.

Only through such a warning is there ascertainable assurance that the accused was aware of this right."

After Miranda, there followed the case of Johnson v. State of New Jersey, 384 U.S. 719, 86 S. Ct. 1772, 16 L. Ed. 2d 882, decided June 20, 1966, in which the Court stated:

"In this case we are called upon to determine whether Escobedo v. State of Illinois, * * * and Miranda v. State of Arizona, * * * should be applied retroactively. We hold that *Escobedo* affects only those cases in which the trial began after June 22, 1964, the date of that decision. We hold further that *Miranda* applies only to cases in which the trial began after the date of our decision one week ago. * * *"

In overruling the Motion to Suppress Evidence in the instant case, the trial judge stated:

"As the Court can see it at this time in the Motion to Suppress, is couched in very general and vague terms and it would be very all inclusive if taken at the recitation therein. But on the basis of what is now before the Court, it can see only one item or perhaps I should say two items which would be at the present before the Court and that is the statement, a separate statement by each of the defendants herein. At this stage of the game, that is all that the Court can see that would be raised by the Motion to Suppress. I believe that's all, I read it again recently but I can't—and any other matters that might sought to be introduced, we would just have to wait until we get to them.

"On the statements themselves and considering all of the surrounding circumstances, together with the education and intelligence of the boys, the Court feels that it cannot allow the Motion to Suppress and that the statements would be admissible in evidence."

We find that the ruling of the trial judge was correct. As stated supra, this case was tried and concluded during 1965, at which time Miranda, supra, had not been decided. Escobedo applies. See, State v. Johnson, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 135; State v. Carter, 248 La. 730, 181 So. 2d 763.

The evidence supra does not reflect that defendant ever requested counsel or the right to secure same; neither have they shown that their counsel were present during the interrogation and their services denied them. The evidence supra does not show that defendants requested the use of the telephone and were denied such use. Therefore, the rights afforded defendants with respect to booking, conferring with counsel, confinement, the use of the telephone, and messenger service, set forth in LSA-R.S. 15:77 (now Articles 228, 229, and 230 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure) and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in 1965, were not violated.

The allegations with respect to violations of LSA-R.S. 15:80, 81, 82, booking and being taken before a committing magistrate, are without merit. Under the facts as shown supra, defendants were booked within twelve hours after their arrest; they were indicted by the Grand Jury of Avoyelles Parish on May 22, 1964 and thereafter ordered to be held without bail. Their confinement was therefore at all times legal confinement. See, State v. Johnson, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 135.

Having concluded that the ruling of the trial judge was correct in denying the Motion to Suppress Evidence, we are also constrained to conclude that the unsigned oral statements of the defendants were admissible in evidence, as held by the trial judge, and that no constitutional rights of the defendants were violated by their admission. The

jurisprudence relied on by counsel for the defendants is not apposite.

Bill of Exceptions No. 5 is without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 6 and 7 were reserved to the overruling of defendants' motions for severance.

In his motion for severance, defendant Woodard contended that his defenses were antagonistic to, inconsistent and contradictory with those of John T. Hopper, his co-defendant. He alleged that his co-defendant made a statement outside of his presence which the State would use against him. Defendant Hopper made the same allegations with respect to his co-defendant Woodard.

Counsel contended that since the unsigned oral statements of the defendants, supra, were admitted in evidence, the severance should be granted. It was contended that in each statement one defendant implicated the other, and that a joint trial was not feasible.

> "According to the law of this state and the overwhelming jurisprudence thereunder, an accused is not entitled to a severance as a matter of right and the granting or refusal of his motion therefor is one that rests entirely within the discretion of the trial judge, his ruling remaining undisturbed unless it is established to be arbitrary by the accused. Article 316 of the Code of Criminal Procedure[7] * * *." State v. Faciane, 233 La. 1028, 99 So. 2d 333; State v. Mack, 243 La. 369, 144 So. 2d 363, cert. denied, 373 U.S. 917, 83 S. Ct. 1306, 10 L. Ed. 2d 416.

The reasons set out by counsel for the defendants for

---

7 "Persons jointly indicted shall be jointly tried, unless the district attorney elect to place such persons separately upon trial, or unless the court, upon motion of defendant, shall, after a hearing contradictorily with the district attorney, order a severance." LSA-R.S. 15:316.

the granting of severance were general. At the time the motions were filed, defendants did not show any particular reason for granting severance or that injury would result to either from a joint trial. They did not show with particularity that their defenses were antagonistic; they did not show that their testimony would be contradictory. See, State v. Progue, 243 La. 337, 144 So. 2d 352. They did not meet the tests which would necessitate severance. See, LSA-R.S. 15:316-317.

We find no abuse of discretion by the trial judge. His charge to the jury adequately protected each defendant.[8] We do not find (and it has not been shown) that either defendant was arbitrary affected by the ruling of the trial judge, or that either actually suffered any prejudice from the joint trial itself.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 6 and 7 are without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 8 and 9 were reserved when the trial judge overruled defendants' motions requesting that they have a private trial instead of a public one, and

---

8 "All evidence relating to any oral admission or oral confessions or other incriminating statements claimed to have been made by a defendant, outside of Court, should be considered with caution and weighed with great care. And, you, Gentlemen, must be convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that such were freely and voluntarily given.

"* * *

"And, in the case of a confession, made outside of Court, by one defendant, it should not be considered by the jury as evidence against the other defendant who was not present or not a party to such confession.

"* * *

"Although there are two defendants and they are jointly charged with the same crime, it is your duty, Gentlemen of the Jury, to give separate, personal consideration to the case of each individual defendant. When you do so, you should analyze what the evidence shows with respect to that individual, leaving out of consideration, entirely, any evidence admitted solely against some other defendant, each defendant is entitled to have his case determined from his own acts and statements, and the other evidence in the case as may be applicable to him."

that the prospective petit jurors on their voir dire be questioned separately and out of the presence of each other.

The basis of defendants' motions was that the alleged attitude of the community was to the effect that undoubtedly its good name had been besmirched, and that undoubtedly such attitude would not be conducive to a fair and impartial trial. Defendants also felt that a prospective juror might say one thing privately and another publicly.

A reading of the record discloses that defendants have not shown that they suffered prejudice from a public trial; neither does it reflect that any untruths were told by the prospective petit jurors on their voir dire. It does not appear that a motion for change of venue was filed. Under such circumstances, we do not find that the trial judge abused his discretion in directing that the trial of the defendants be public.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 8 and 9 are without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 10 was reserved when the trial judge sustained the State's challenge for cause of the prospective juror Rudolph Paul Gremillion.

We find that the ruling of the trial judge was correct; his per curiam clearly expresses his reasons as follows:

> "The facts stated in the bill, with reference to the pending charge against Rudolph Gremillion, are generally correct. He said he had been arrested and had furnished a bail bond in another parish, Pointe Coupee. He had never been called for trial and had not paid a fine.
>
> "The Sheriff who reported there was no charge pending against Gremillion was the Avoyelles Sheriff. He said he had called the New Roads, or Pointe

Coupee Sheriff. The Court realized that whether a formal charge by bill of indictment or bill of information was actually filed, in the process of grand jury proceedings, or district attorney's investigation, were matters which the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff could not give to the Court with any certainty. It was hearsay from another sheriff, by telephone conversation or radio communication. The Court could not take a chance. The prospective juror was excused. Had he been accepted, these same attorneys would be arguing to the Court now, that this juror was incompetent; he had a criminal charge against him; he was under bond at the time and the matter had never been disposed of. The Court can see no prejudice or wrong to the defendants. They are not entitled to particular jurors; only to a fair and impartial jury. This they had; there is no question about it. It is not contended otherwise by the defendants themselves. They have a right to reject obnoxious jurors or challenge them for cause. The Court feels there was no harm or wrong done to the defendants by excusing this juror."

Bill of Exceptions No. 10 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 11 was reserved when the trial judge denied the peremptory challenge of defendant Woodard to the prospective juror V. J. Rabalais, such challenge being his thirteenth peremptory challenge.

Counsel for defendants contend that at the time they were refused severance, it was impossible and impracticable for counsel to divorce themselves from either defendant; therefore, the same counsel represented both defendants. They argue that the peremptory challenges used by one defendant should have had no effect on the challenges used by the other defendant. They further argue that under the decisions of this Court, in State v. Breedlove,

199 La. 965, 7 So. 2d 221, and in State v. Oliphant, 220 La. 489, 56 So. 2d 846, the ruling of the trial judge in connection with the situation reflected by this Bill of Exceptions constitutes prejudicial and reversible error. They also rely on the case of State v. Sevin, 243 La. 1023, 150 So. 2d 1, as sustaining their contention.

The trial judge in his per curiam to the instant bill stated:

> "Mr. Gravel was chief counsel for both defendants. As he excused [sic] his peremptory challenges, he would state that it was on the part of the defendant, Mr. Woodard. After he had used twelve (12) peremptory challenges on behalf of Mr. Woodard, he sought to excuse Mr. V. J. Rabalais, peremptorily, on behalf of Mr. Woodard. He had exhausted his peremptory challenges at that time, for this defendant. But he could have excused him peremptorily on behalf of Mr. Hopper, the other defendant. He did not do so. Instead, he accepted him 'at the request of Mr. Hopper.'
>
> "If Rabalais was an obnoxious juror, Mr. Gravel could have excused him, peremptorily, on behalf of Mr. Hopper, who still had at that time eleven (11) unused peremptory challenges and who never did exhaust his peremptory challenges. Mr. Gravel represented both defendants and they were being jointly tried. He was blowing hot and cold, at the same time, as counsel for both. One of my defendants does not want him; the other wants him, so I'll accept him. And I say all this to you, Judge, in the absence of the particular juror involved, who was outside the Courtroom at the time."

LSA-R.S. 15:354 (now Art. 799 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure) provided:

> "In all trials for any crime punishable with death, or necessarily with imprisonment at hard

> labor, each defendant shall be entitled to challenge peremptorily twelve jurors, and the prosecution twelve for each defendant. * * *"

LSA-R.S. 15:353 (now Art. 800 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure) provided:

> "No defendant can complain of any ruling sustaining or refusing to sustain a challenge for cause, unless his peremptory challenges shall have been exhausted before the completion of the panel; moreover, the erroneous allowance of challenges for cause affords the defendant no ground of complaint, unless the effect of such ruling is the exercise by the prosecution of more peremptory challenges than it is entitled to by law, or unless the defendant by such ruling is forced to accept an obnoxious juror."

In State v. Sevin, supra, this Court stated:

> "The right of an accused to peremptory challenges of prospective jurors who are to try him is guaranteed by the constitution of our State. LSA-Const. art. 1, § 10. * * * This court recognizes that an erroneous ruling of the court which deprives a defendant of one of his peremptory challenges is a substantial violation of his constitutional right to a fair trial and requires reversal. * * * *"

In State v. Breedlove, supra, this Court held that where the trial judge erroneously refused to sustain defendant's challenge to prospective juror for cause, and thereafter defendant exhausted his peremptory challenges, but made no showing that any occasion arose after exhaustion of peremptory challenges when defendant needed a peremptory challenge or would have used it against any of the remaining jurors of the panel, there was no reversible error.

In State v. Oliphant, supra, this Court held that when

an accused, by an erroneous ruling of the trial judge, is deprived of one of his twelve peremptory challenges to prospective jurors, the ruling of the court constitutes a real and substantial violation of the constitutional or statutory rights of the defendant.

LSA-R.S. 15:354, supra (substantially the same in the new Code of Criminal Procedure), means that each defendant, though jointly tried, is entitled to challenge twelve jurors. State v. Sevin, supra. Herein, defendant Woodard exercised his twelve peremptory challenges before challenging Mr. Rabalais. In challenging Mr. Rabalais, Woodard's counsel contended that he was objectionable and obnoxious. When the bill was reserved, counsel did not show how Mr. Rabalais was obnoxious; he does not show herein how he was obnoxious. Counsel does not show this Court where defendant Woodard suffered any prejudice from Mr. Rabalais's serving on the jury which heard this prosecution. Under such circumstances, we cannot hold that defendant was forced to accept an obnoxious juror or suffered prejudice. Therefore, having exhausted his peremptory challenges, he was not entitled to exercise a thirteenth challenge with respect to Mr. Rabalais.

Bill of Exceptions No. 11 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 12 was reserved to the trial court's overruling defendant's objection to the peremptory challenge by the State of the prospective juror Alton Tassin.

Defense counsel contend that the ruling was a retraction by the court of a prior ruling on an agreement among defense counsel, the District Attorney, and the court. Counsel contend that the allowing of the challenge was irregular and should not have been allowed.

Although previous to the challenging of Mr. Tassin

there had been an agreement among defense counsel, the District Attorney, and the court, indicating that once a prospective juror had been accepted by both the State and defense counsel, there would be no further questioning of the prospective juror's qualifications, the action of the trial judge was in strict accordance with LSA-R.S. 15:359,[9] which was mentioned in the agreement.

We find no abuse of discretion by the trial judge in allowing the peremptory challenge of this prospective juror;[10] likewise, we find that defendants suffered no prejudice.

Bill of Exceptions No. 12 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 13 was reserved when the trial judge overruled defense counsel's objection to the excusing of the prospective juror Alex Wyble, who had previously been accepted by both the State and the defendants.

This prospective juror testified on June 26, 1965 that he had never been arrested for anything so small as a traffic ticket, and he was accepted as a juror by both the State and the defendants. The court then informed counsel that it would take no action on this juror at that time, because it had been informed that he had previously been given an arrest ticket by the State Police. On June 28,

---

9 "Although a juror may have been accepted by both the prosecution and the defense, he may, none the less, up to the beginning of the taking of evidence, be challenged for cause by either side, or be excused either for cause or by consent of both sides." LSA-R.S. 15:359 (now Art. 795 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure.)

10 "The jurors shall be tendered first to the prosecution, and, if accepted, then tendered to the defense. After a juror has been accepted by both sides, neither side has the right to challenge him peremptorily, but it shall be within the discretion of the court, and not subject to review to allow either side to peremptorily challenge jurors up to the time that the jury is impaneled." LSA-R.S. 15:358 (See, Arts. 788 and 795 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure.)

1965, the District Attorney informed the court that there was a traffic violation pending against Alex Wyble, and that an original bill had been signed by him that day. The trial court then excused this prospective juror.

We find that the actions of the District Attorney were irregular, but, despite this fact, the ruling of the trial judge was correct and in accordance with LSA-R.S. 15:172,[11] which vests him with discretion in matters such as those presented in this bill.

Bill of Exceptions No. 13 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 14 was reserved to the ruling of the trial judge denying defendant Woodard's challenge for cause of the prospective juror Alvin Coco.

Defendant Woodard, who had exhausted his peremptory challenges, contended that because the prospective juror had in the past engaged the services of the law firm of Roy and Roy, of which Chris Roy, associate counsel with the District Attorney herein, was a member, and because a close friendship existed between Chris Roy and the prospective juror, he could not render a fair and impartial verdict. See, LSA-R.S. 15:351.

---

11 "The qualifications to serve as a grand juror or a petit juror in any of the courts of this state shall be as follows:

"To be a citizen of this state, not less than twenty-one years of age, a bona fide resident of the parish in and for which the court is holden, for one year next preceding such service, able to read and write the English language, not under interdiction or charged with any offense, or convicted at any time of any felony, provided that there shall be no distinction made on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude; and provided further, that the district judge shall have discretion to decide upon the competency of jurors in particular cases where from physical infirmity or from relationship, or other causes, the person may be, in the opinion of the judge, incompetent to sit upon the trial of any particular case.

"In addition to the foregoing qualifications, jurors shall be persons of well known good character and standing in the community." LSA-R.S. 15:172 (See, Articles 401 and 787 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure.)

This prospective juror testified that his relationship to the law firm of Roy and Roy, as well as his friendship with Chris Roy, would have no effect on his decision in the prosecution. Under these facts, we find no abuse of discretion by the trial judge in denying defendant Woodard's challenge for cause.[12]

Bill of Exceptions No. 14 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 15 was reserved when the trial judge denied defense counsel's challenge for cause of the prospective juror Michael Scanlon.

The prospective juror testified that he knew the mother of the victim, having been in her company four or five times, but that he had not seen her since her son's death. He also testified that he knew the father of Gary Morrison, a witness for the State. Despite his relations with these two persons, he was of the opinion that he could make a fair decision. He said, "I would say this, I don't think it would have any influence on me but if I was the boys I don't think I'd want me."

We do not find that the trial judge abused his discretion in denying the challenge at the time he did. We note that later (after the challenge was denied and more testimony had been adduced), when counsel for the defendants excused the prospective juror Michael Scanlon, the trial court also excused him. The instant jury does not bear the name of Scanlon. Therefore, defendants suffered no prejudice; their constitutional rights were not violated, and the action of the trial judge was not arbitrary in any manner.

Bill of Exceptions No. 15 is without merit.

---

[12] The jury which rendered the verdict does not bear the name of Alvin Coco.

Bill of Exceptions No. 16 was reserved when the trial court denied defense counsel's challenge for cause of the prospective juror Murkle Dupuy.

The prospective juror testified that he went to the Pelican Club quite regularly and had been there on the night of April 18, 1964, leaving around twelve o'clock. He had no definite recollection of seeing the defendants. He testified that despite his attendance at the Club, he could render a fair and impartial decision in the prosecution.

Defense counsel contended that this prospective juror's attendance at the Club could have a mental effect upon his decision, particularly if there were witnesses in the case who had also been in attendance.

We find no abuse of the trial court's discretion in refusing to excuse the prospective juror for cause, but we also note that he was excused when defense counsel exercised a peremptory challenge for defendant Hopper. Under the circumstances, the defendants suffered no prejudice.

Bill of Exceptions No. 16 is without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 17, 18 and 19 were reserved to the refusal of the trial judge to order the State to furnish the defendants with certain desired particulars requested in motion and supplemental motion for particulars.

The record reveals that a motion for bill of particulars was filed by defense counsel, and that thereafter several supplemental motions were filed. In response to the motions, the trial court ordered that defendants be furnished certain information. They were given copies of Major Henderson's notes taken during the oral interrogation of defendants, supra, and were given a statement made by Cyrus Frazier. They were told that, "the only confessions

and/or statements and/or admissions made by defendants to various deputies and/or other persons, were oral and not recorded electronically; that the State does have notes written by Harold Henderson of the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's Department; that the defendants are not entitled to the names and addresses of persons to whom any such confessions, and/or statements and/or admissions were made, nor to the names and addresses of the witnesses to said confessions, and/or admissions and statements." They were also told that no warrant had issued for their arrest; they were not given all information leading to their arrest; they were not given the names of witnesses to be called by the State; and they were not informed of the evidence presented to the grand jury which indicted them.

Defense counsel contend that by not being given all of the particulars requested, defendants suffered prejudice and were denied their constitutional rights.

LSA-R.S. 15:215 (now Articles 433-434 of the new Code of Criminal Procedure) provided that the sessions of the grand jury should be secret. Therefore, whatever information was submitted to the grand jury which indicted the defendants is a matter of secrecy between the District Attorney and the grand jury. Defendants were not entitled to know what evidence was submitted to the grand jury which investigated the instant offense, nor were they entitled to know what evidence was in the possession of certain Parish or State officials and submitted to the investigating grand jury.

> "The proper function of a bill of particulars is to inform the accused in greater detail of the nature of the crime of which he is charged. Articles 235 and 288 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. * * * That it may be used as a device for ascertaining

> the nature of the evidence produced at the hearing of the grand jury is certainly a novel proposition and one unsupported by authority. * * * " State v. Simpson, 216 La. 212, 43 So. 2d 585, cert. denied, 339 U.S. 929, 70 S. Ct. 625, 90 L. Ed. 1350.

A reading of the motions for bill of particulars and the supplemental motions, as well as the State's answers to such, constrains us to find that the State was not required to furnish any more information than it did with respect to the probable cause of defendants' arrest. Present jurisprudence does not compel the State to reveal the sources of all information within its knowledge. McCray v. State of Illinois, 386 U.S. 300, 87 S. Ct. 1056, 18 L. Ed. 2d 62; State v. Hunter, 250 La. 295, 195 So. 2d 273.

Defense counsel were not entitled to have a list of the State's witnesses. State v. Jones, 249 La. 324, 186 So. 2d 608. The fact that the defense might be surprised by the appearance of a particular witness does not mean that the name of such witness must be submitted to counsel prior to trial. We know of no law to the contrary.

The oral statements and other evidence within the State's possession were not such as had to be revealed in answer to a motion for a bill of particulars. See, State v. Pailet, 246 La. 483, 165 So. 2d 294. The function of the bill of particulars is to inform the accused concerning matters which are pertinent to the charge against him. The trial court in its discretion determines what is fair to the accused in ordering the State to reveal that which the defendant will need to defend himself. The accused, however, is not entitled to the evidence upon which the State relies to establish its case. State v. Bourg, 248 La. 844, 182 So. 2d 510; State v. Barksdale, 247 La. 198, 170 So. 2d 374, cert. denied, 382 U.S. 921, 86 S. Ct. 297, 15 L. Ed. 2d 236.

We find that defendants suffered no prejudice in not being given all information they desired; their constitutional rights were not violated. They were furnished sufficient details for the preparation of their defense. The trial judge did not abuse his discretion and acted in all fairness to the rights of the accused.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 17, 18 and 19 are without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 40 and 48 were reserved to the trial court's overruling defendants' objection to the District Attorney testifying as a witness for the State.

The District Attorney's testimony was with respect to the alleged statements given by the defendants, supra, the identification of certain State's exhibits, and certain events which took place on the morning of April 19, 1964.

Defense counsel objected to the District Attorney testifying on the ground that it was improper and prejudicial to the rights of the accused for the District Attorney to be both the prosecutor and a material witness in the case. A minor objection was also made to the effect that the testimony of the District Attorney would impeach that of a State witness. Objection was also made that a proper foundation had not been laid for the introduction of certain exhibits.

Under the facts of this prosecution as disclosed by the testimony attached to the bills of exceptions, it was necessary that the District Attorney testify. He had a peculiar knowledge of what took place on the morning the offense was committed. It was really necessary that he testify in order for the defendants to have a fair and impartial trial. A foundation was properly laid for the introduction of

exhibits. We also find that the testimony of the District Attorney was explanatory rather than impeaching. With respect to Bill of Exceptions No. 48, we note that the trial judge explicitly told the jury to disregard completely certain testimony which was sought to be elicited in rebuttal.

We find that the trial judge had to exercise his discretion in this matter, and under its peculiar facts and circumstances he was constrained to permit the District Attorney to testify. We do not find that he abused his discretion. No authority which absolutely prohibits a district attorney from testifying in a prosecution which he is conducting has been pointed out to us. Counsel for the defendants have not shown that defendants suffered any prejudice from the testimony of the District Attorney. We find no reversible error.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 40 and 48 are without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 24 and 25 were reserved when the trial judge ruled that the proper foundation and predicate had been laid for the introduction in evidence of certain admissions, confessions, or statements allegedly made by the defendants and overruled defendants' objections to their introduction in evidence.

During the trial of this case, the District Attorney informed the trial court and defense counsel that the State was laying the foundation to introduce the following:

1. Oral remarks made by defendant Woodard to Chief Paul Dubea in the presence of Officer DeNux at the Ranch House Motel, as well as any and all remarks made by him en route to the Marksville Parish Courthouse.

2. Any and all remarks, confessions and/or

statements made by defendant Hopper to Sergeant Pat Lemoine and Trooper Eddie Bordelon on April 19, 1964.

3. The oral confession and/or admissions and statements made by defendant Woodard to Major Harold Henderson.

4. The oral confession and/or admissions and statements made by the defendant Hopper to Major Harold Henderson.

5. The oral confession and/or admissions or statements made by defendant Woodard to District Attorney Anthony J. Roy, Jr., around sunrise April 19, 1964.

6. Oral remarks made by defendant Hooper to Joe Michell, an employee of the Pelican Club.

7. Oral remarks of a conversation between the defendants and a third party in the Avoyelles Parish Jail on Monday, April 21, 1964; the remarks were overheard by a witness who would later testify, a Reverend Bell.

After the State had laid its foundation for the introduction of the above in evidence and counsel for the defendants had voiced objection, the trial court ruled that from all of the evidence a necessary foundation had been laid for the introduction of four different statements or confessions made by the accused, namely; a statement by defendant Woodard to Chief Paul Dubea; defendant Hopper's statement to Troopers Lemoine and Bordelon; defendant Woodard's statement to Major Harold Henderson in the Sheriff's office; and defendant Hopper's statement to Major Harold Henderson.

Defendants contend that the admission of the statements, supra, was erroneous because they were obtained and made in violation of the statutory State and Federal

Constitutional rights of the accused, particularly but not exclusively LSA-R.S. 15:59, 60, 66, 67, 70, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82 and 142; Art. I, Sec. 11, La. Const. of 1921; Art. I, Sec. 9, La. Const. of 1921; Art. I, Sec. 2, La. Const. of 1921; the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. They also submit the same arguments advanced in Bills of Exceptions Nos. 5, 17, 18 and 19. They also urge that all statements were not given to them in advance of trial, and that they were entitled to such an order to prepare their defense.

Counsel for the defendants had in their possession for inspection and preparation of their defense the statements given by the defendants to Major Henderson. The other statements were not written confessions, and counsel were told in advance of trial that the State did have certain oral statements which it would attempt to introduce in evidence.

> "In requesting a pre-trial examination of the wire-tap recordings, defense counsel find themselves confronted with the well-established rule that all evidence relating to a pending criminal case which is in possession of the State is privileged and not subject to inspection by the accused unless and until it is offered in evidence at the trial. The single exception to this rule has been made in instances where the State has in its possession a written confession of the accused. * * *" State v. Pailet, 246 La. 483, 165 So. 2d 294. See, State v. Dorsey, 207 La. 928, 22 So. 2d 273.

A reading of the testimony attached to the instant bills constrains us to find that a proper foundation was laid for the introduction of the statements in evidence, and that their admission was proper after such foundation had been laid. No showing to the contrary has been made. Our

reasoning in Bills of Exceptions Nos. 5, 17, 18 and 19 applies to these bills. No further discussion is necessary.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 24 and 25 are without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 38 and 39 were reserved when the trial court ruled that the statements made by defendants could be submitted to the jury.

Defense counsel contended that the proper foundation and predicate for the statements had not been laid, and that their submission to the jury would violate defendants' constitutional rights.

A review of the testimony attached to the instant bills discloses that Major Henderson testified that he had the notes or statements in his possession. He provided the court with the originals; his handwriting was identified. He read the statements to the jury and testified that he wrote down as accurately as he could what the defendants told him. He said he did not go beyond the responses of the defendants in the statements.

> "There is no rule in this state requiring the signing of a confession by the accused.
>
> "'A confession is the voluntary declaration made by a person who has committed a crime or misdemeanor, to another, acknowledging his agency or participation in same. * * * A confession may be either express or implied. It may be a naked statement by defendant that he is guilty of the crime, or it may be a full statement of the circumstances of its commission, including his part in it. Also it may be in the form of a letter or of several letters to different persons, or may consist of detached conversations with many people, or it may be a formal confession, or all of these together.' 16 Corpus Juris, 715, verbo 'Criminal Law,' and au-

thorities cited in foot-notes." State v. Eisenhardt, 185 La. 308, 169 So. 417, cert. denied, 299 U.S. 512, 57 S. Ct. 49, 81 L. Ed. 378. See, State v. Dierlamm, 189 La. 544, 180 So. 135.

Our discussion of Bill of Exceptions No. 5 also applies to these bills. Therefore having found that the Motion to Suppress Evidence was properly overruled by the trial judge, we conclude that his rulings permitting the State to submit the statements of the defendants to the jury were correct.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 38 and 39 are without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 27 was reserved when the trial judge ruled that the State during trial could go into the actual contents of the statements made by the defendants to Major Henderson.

Counsel for defendants contended that a proper foundation had not been laid for the introduction of the statements, and that the corpus delicti had not been proved. Counsel urged that the trial judge's ruling violated defendants' constitutional rights.

The instant bill really presents nothing new for our consideration. Our discussion of Bills of Exceptions Nos. 5, 24, 25, 38 and 39 applies to this bill. No further discussion is necessary.

Bill of Exception No. 27 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 28 was reserved when the trial judge denied the request of defendants' counsel for the sequestration of certain attorneys who had been subpoenaed by defense counsel.

Some of the attorneys represented Mrs. Althea Dun-

can, the mother of the victim of the instant crime, in her civil suit against the defendants and the father of defendant Woodard. One of the attorneys addressed the trial court and stated:

> "Now, we appeal to Your Honor to use your discretion in allowing us to remain in the Courtroom because there is no conceivable purpose in Mr. Gravel calling us as witnesses for the defendants.
>
> If we were called to give testimony in this case it would be prejudicial to the defendants. Further, if we were called as witnesses for the defense, we would claim the privilege existing between attorney and client provided in R.S. 15:475, which would prohibit us from giving any testimony in this case about our knowledge of the case which we gained while we were working for Mrs. Duncan."

This attorney also stated that the District Attorney had no objection to the attorneys being in the courtroom.

A reading of the colloquy among the trial court, counsel in this case, and the attorneys discloses that when the trial judge permitted the attorneys to remain in the courtroom, he gave them proper admonition as to what they might discuss with other persons. Under LSA-R.S. 15:371, the trial judge was vested with discretion to order or refuse to order the sequestration of witnesses. Counsel for the defendants have not shown that defendants suffered any prejudice from the denial of sequestration by the trial judge. Under such circumstances, we do not find that the trial judge abused his discretion.

Bill of Exceptions No. 28 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 29 was reserved when the trial court allowed the State's Exhibits 1-TB through and including 6-TB to be admitted and filed in evidence.

The testimony attached to the instant bill reflects that Dr. John Maxwell of Alexandria, a specialist in pathology, performed the autopsy on the instant victim on April 19, 1964, acting at the request of Dr. Henry J. Kaufman, Jr., Coroner of Avoyelles Parish. To better orient himself and for a diagnosis pertaining to the cause of death, Dr. Maxwell made pictures of the autopsy. He took color picture slides, which were later developed into photographs.

State's Exhibits 1-TB through 6-TB consist of: 1) a picture slide of a full face view of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 2) a picture slide of the right side of the head of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 3) a picture of the left side of the head of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 4) a picture slide of the under side of the brain of Joseph Ralph Beeson; 5) a picture slide of the floor of the skull of Joseph Ralph Beeson; and 6) a picture slide of both lungs of Joseph Ralph Beeson.

Counsel for the defendants objected to the offering of the slides in evidence for these reasons:

(1) Proper foundation for their introduction had not been laid;

(2) There was no predicate established that would permit the purported offerings to be received in evidence;

(3) They were taken at a time too remote to be relevant or material or of any probative value;

(4) They were not necessary or material to any issue or fact involved in this case at that time;

(5) They were gruesome, ghastly, shocking, emotionally disturbing and were prejudicial, if received in evidence and viewed by the jury, to the rights of the defendants;

(6) There was no dispute as to the cause of death; counsel had stipulated:—"Defense wishes to stipulate that Ralph Beeson died in the early morning hours of April 19, 1964; that his death resulted from trauma to the brain incidental to and attendant to a basal fracture of the skull."

(7) That the autopsy and what was revealed thereby was not the handiwork of either defendant, but the handiwork and professional handiwork as a result of Dr. Maxwell;

(8) That there was no probative value that could be attached to the offerings.

The trial court viewed the slides and then permitted the jury to view them projected on a screen. The Court stated:

> "The projection of films or slides identified by the witness [Dr. Maxwell] on the screen which is hereby the Court, the Court believes that such films or slides would be admissible in evidence as factual and pictorial data to support the testimony and expert conclusions of the witness."

A review of the evidence attached to the instant bill reflects that a proper foundation was laid for the introduction of the slides, and that a predicate was established for their offering. The slides were made on the day of death, not at a remote time, and were relevant to the prosecution. They were relevant to the theory of the State and to the admission of counsel for the defendants that the victim's death resulted from trauma to the brain.

The objection that the slides were gruesome and would have the effect of prejudicing the minds of the jury has no merit. The slides were all associated with the cause of the

victim's death and reflected the injuries he allegedly received. State v. Dowdy, 217 La. 773, 47 So. 2d 496. The fact that objects or photographs constitute or portray a repulsive spectacle and tend to prejudice the jury furnishes no valid ground for their exclusion where they are otherwise relevant. State v. Hamilton, 249 La. 392, 187 So. 2d 417.

The trial judge correctly ruled that the slides were admissible to substantiate the testimony of the witness Dr. John Maxwell.

Bill of Exceptions No. 29 is without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 30 and 31 were reserved when the trial court denied the request of defense counsel for the production in evidence and view by counsel of the photographs made from the slides identified as State's Exhibits 1-TB through 6-TB.

It goes without saying that before the photographs were produced (they were later produced), the slides from which they were made had to be introduced in evidence and testimony given with respect thereto. This was a phase of the prosecution when the trial court denied counsel's request. The request of counsel was therefore premature. No prejudice has been shown, and defendants suffered no prejudice.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 30 and 31 are without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 32 was reserved when the trial court permitted the photographic prints of the color slides, State Trial Exhibits 1-TB through 6-TB, to be admitted in evidence.

Defense counsel submitted as their objection to the

admission of the photographic prints, the same reasons advanced in Bill of Exceptions No. 29 as objection to the admissibility of the color slides.

We have viewed the photographs submitted to this Court as a part of the evidence, and we do not find that they are gruesome, morbid, or of any other character as would prejudice the jury. State v. Fulghum, 242 La. 767, 138 So. 2d 569. They are relevant to the prosecution of this case and are evidentiary to the alleged cause of death. Our discussion of Bill of Exceptions No. 29 applies to the instant bill.

Bill of Exceptions No. 32 is without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 33 and 34 were reserved when the trial court permitted the State to offer in evidence mug photographs of the defendants, State Trial Exhibits Nos. 3 and 4, and testimony concerning same.

Defense counsel contended that the ruling of the trial judge permitting the photographs to be offered in evidence and allowing Deputy Sheriff Allen Normand to testify with respect to same violated defendants' statutory and constitutional rights.

Allen Normand was Chief Identification Officer in charge of records at the time of trial; his duties included fingerprinting, mugging, keeping records, and identifying evidence. He was also president of the Louisiana Association of Identification. The officer identified the pictures of the defendants, testifying that he mugged the defendants at the same time he fingerprinted them. He testified from notes as to the physical qualities of the defendants. We find that he was well qualified to give the testimony that he did, and that such testimony was relevant to the instant prosecution.

"We do not think that permitting the coroner to testify as to his findings upon the physical examination made of the accused or the admission in evidence of pictures of the accused denied him due process of law simply because the examination was made and the pictures were taken while he was in custody of the police and without counsel. We know of no provision of the law which requires the consent of the person arrested and charged with a crime for these things to be done. Neither the testimony of the coroner nor the admission in evidence of the pictures violated defendant's constitutional privilege against compulsory self-incrimination. * * *" State v. Hughes, 244 La. 774, 154 So. 2d 395.

We do not find that the trial judge abused his discretion by admitting the mug shots in evidence. They were relevant evidence and therefore admissible.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 33 and 34 are without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 35 and 36 were reserved when the trial judge allowed the State to introduce in evidence the shoes worn by the defendants on April 18th and 19th, 1964, State Trial Exhibits Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Defense counsel contended that the State had not laid the proper foundation and predicate for the introduction of the exhibits, and that they were irrelevant and immaterial and of no probative value. Counsel also objected for the same reasons advanced in Bills of Exceptions Nos. 33 and 34.

Deputy Allen Normand properly identified the shoes and testified that they had been in his possession, having been turned over to him by defendants at the time of fingerprinting. Under the circumstances, we find that the proper foundation was laid for the introduction of the shoes

in evidence. They were relevant evidence and therefore admissible. State v. Aspara, 113 La. 940, 37 So. 883.

Bill of Exceptions Nos. 35 and 36 are without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 37 was reserved when the trial court allowed the State to introduce in evidence State Trial Exhibit No. 9, a picture of a Model R1205 Panel (Corvan) truck.

Counsel for the defendants contended that the exhibit had not been properly identified, and that the proper foundation had not been laid for its introduction. They also contended that the witness Gary Morrison had not been properly qualified to give testimony to lay the predicate for the introduction of the exhibit. They further contended that the exhibit was irrelevant and immaterial evidence and of no probative value.

The prosecution alleged that at the time of the instant occurrence a truck was near the concrete slab, supra. Gary Morrison, a friend of the deceased who accompanied him to the Pelican Club on the night of April 18, 1964, testified as to the events which took place before the death of Joseph Ralph Beeson; he testified as to the physical surroundings outside of the Pelican Club. We find that it was proper for the State to ask him if the truck he had seen near the slab resembled that portrayed in the picture. The exhibit was relevant evidence.

A reading of the testimony attached to the instant bill reflects that a proper foundation was laid for the introduction of State Trial Exhibit No. 9.

Defendants have not shown that they suffered any prejudice from the admission of this exhibit. We find that it was admissible. State v. Page, 173 La. 279, 136 So. 609.

Bill of Exceptions No. 37 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 41 was reserved when the trial court permitted the State to introduce in evidence State Trial Exhibits Nos. 22, 23 and 24, color photographs of a cement slab on the side of the Pelican Club.

Defense counsel objected to the introduction of the color photographs on the ground that the offering was made without proper foundation and predicate having been laid. They contended that the photographs had not been identified in such a way as to permit them to have any probative value. Counsel contended further that the slab had been hosed down prior to the taking of the photographs and for that reason they did not actually reflect the area because of the crowd at the scene as testified to by witnesses. It was still further contended that the exhibits were not of any material or relevant value, "other than the deceased himself and the situation as reflected at the time that the photographs were taken."

We find that the photographs were properly identified. They were identified by Deputy Sheriff Allen Normand who took the pictures. The reverse side of the photographs reflect that they were taken at 4:00 A.M., April 19, 1964. A proper foundation and predicate was therefore laid for the introduction of the exhibits in evidence.

Defendants have not shown that they suffered any prejudice from the introduction of the exhibits. We find that the photographs were relevant evidence, but if not so, they served as secondary evidence. Cf., State v. Palmer, 227 La. 691, 80 So. 2d 374.

Bill of Exceptions No. 41 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 42 was reserved when the trial

court permitted the State to offer in evidence State Trial Exhibits Nos. 37, 37-A and 37-B, a paper bag and two drinking glasses.

Counsel for the defendants objected to the introduction of the exhibits on the grounds that the proper foundation had not been laid, proper identification had not been made, and the offering was irrelevant and immaterial and of no probative value.

M. J. Juneau testified that he had worked at the Pelican Club about one and one-half years prior to April 19, 1964. He identified the glasses as being similar to those used at the Club on April 19, 1964.

We find that a proper foundation was laid for the introduction of the exhibits. Defense counsel have not shown that the defendants were prejudiced by the introduction of the exhibits. They merely state that the State was obviously attempting to minimize the effect of Beeson's striking Hopper with a drinking glass by offering the instant exhibits. If this was so, it was the State's privilege, and the evidence was relevant.

Bill of Exceptions No. 42 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 43 was reserved when the trial judge, outside of the presence of the jury, ruled that Mrs. Althea Duncan, mother of the victim, could testify in the presence of the jury with respect to a conversation she had with the defendant Hopper in the Sheriff's office on April 19, 1964. She asked Hopper, "Why?" Hopper responded, "just drunk."

Defense counsel contend that the trial judge committed error in permitting Mrs. Duncan to testify as she did, because:

"Obviously, this testimony should not have been allowed for the reason that the entire conversation between the two parties and circumstances related thereto leaves no indication as to what was meant by the remarks, and for the further reason, that if the remark of the defendant as testified to by Mrs. Duncan was intended as an oral admission of any kind, it was not one of the 'seven areas' referred to by the District Attorney (see Bill of Exception No. 24). If it was intended to be used as an oral admission then the same objections made by the defendants to the other oral remarks would be applicable here."

We do not find that the conversation testified to by Mrs. Duncan was intended as an oral admission. Counsel have not shown where the trial judge abused his discretion, and we do not find that he did. Likewise, counsel have not shown how the defendants suffered prejudice by Mrs. Duncan's relating her conversation with the defendant Hopper.

Bill of Exceptions No. 43 is without merit.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 44 and 45 were reserved when the trial court denied defendants' motions for a mistrial.

Billy Frazier, age twenty-one at the time of trial, and a former college roommate of Joe Woodard, who was with the defendants on the night of the instant occurrence, was asked the following questions by the State in the interest of perjury during his testimony:

"Mr. Frazier, let's get down to it. You remember when you were in that Grand Jury when you were subpoenaed to appear before this Grand Jury last year in April of 1964—let me ask my question and you can object."

"Do you remember when you were subpoenaed

to appear before this Avoyelles Parish Grand Jury last May of 1964, do you remember that?"

"You remember when you were subpoenaed before the Grand Jury?"

"You remember how long you stayed in the Grand Jury?"

The witness responded that he wasn't subpoenaed; that "a Policeman up at Tech came and told me to come down here." The witness then said he remembered when he was subpoenaed. He did not answer the question as to the length of time he remained with the grand jury.

After defense counsel's objection and colloquy between the court and counsel, Mr. Roy made the following statement:

"Yes, sir, we are in accord with, Your Honor—but the State is interested in and the Court is interested in and the Jury is interested perjury and I have a right to ask him as a basis of a foundation to find out what he said in there and he didn't say what he said—like to lay the foundation for that, Your Honor."

Thereafter, the trial court ruled that the grand jury proceedings were secret, and that the witness did not have to answer the questions. It stated:

"The Court will instruct the Jury to disregard that statement entirely as you were told before the statements of the attorneys are not evidence and whatever the Court rules out is not to be considered by you in any manner, shape or form, so I will tell you that you are to disregard that statement by the District Attorney give it no weight or consideration whatsoever and the Court will deny the motion for the mistrial."

Previously, in the presence of the jury, Frazier was asked, "Mr. Frazier, are these the pants and shirts that Joe Woodard was wearing that night?" Counsel for the defendants objected to the question on the ground that the evidence had been excluded, and that there was an improper display of it. The State withdrew the evidence; the jury was retired; counsel for the defendants identified the evidence; colloquy followed; the trial judge denied the motion for a mistrial.

Defense counsel contend that despite the trial judge's ruling, the rights of the defendants were prejudiced; they also contend that the defendants' rights were prejudiced by the improper display of withdrawn evidence.

A reading of the testimony attached to the instant bills convinces us that the substantial rights of the accused were not prejudiced. The trial judge properly instructed the jury at the time the instant errors were committed and again instructed it in his general charge as follows:—"Any evidence as to which an objection was sustained by the Court, and any evidence ordered stricken by the Court, must be entirely disregarded by you."

The jurisprudence is legion that generally instructions of the trial court at proper time nullify the prejudicial effect of an improper statement made by a prosecuting officer during the course of trial. State v. Dowdy, 217 La. 773, 47 So. 2d 496; State v. Brazile, 234 La. 145, 99 So. 2d 62; State v. Brossette, 229 La. 420, 86 So. 2d 87; State v. Jackson, 227 La. 642, 80 So. 2d 105.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 44 and 45 are without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 46 was reserved when, outside of the presence of the jury, the trial judge ruled that Rev-

erend John D. Bell, a Methodist Minister of the Gospel who visited the Avoyelles Parish Jail on the morning of April 20, 1964, could testify before the jury that during a conversation between the defendants and an unidentified third person he overheard defendant Woodard make the statement, "I wish to hell I had had time to stomp some more to death."

Bill of Exceptions No. 47 was reserved when the trial judge ruled during trial and in the presence of the jury that Reverend Bell's testimony that he overheard defendant Woodard say in a conversation between the defendants and an unidentified third person, "I wish to hell that I had had time to stomp another one to death," was admissible.

Counsel for the defendants contend that the proper foundation and predicate were not laid for the testimony, and that it was prejudicial to the defendants, being fragmentary in nature.

We have read all of the testimony attached to the instant bills and find that proper foundation and predicate were laid for Reverend Bell's statement. His extensive testimony outlines in detail his mission at the jail, his visibility of the defendants, and his position at the time defendant Woodard's statement was overheard.

We do not find that the statement, supra, is incomplete. It expresses a complete thought. The unidentified person was Billy Frazier, and he testified that he did not hear Joe Woodard make a statement to the effect "I wish I had more time I'd of stomped—so I could stomp some others or another one to death." The jury therefore had for consideration the testimony of Frazier and Reverend Bell, which was contradictory. Defense counsel have not specifically shown us how the defendants suffered such

prejudice by the admission of the statement overheard by Reverend Bell as would warrant reversal. We do not find that the trial judge abused his discretion or committed reversible error by allowing the Reverend Bell to testify as he did.

Bills of Exceptions Nos. 46 and 47 are without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 49 was reserved when the trial court overruled defense counsel's motion for a mistrial.

Lionel Bonstaff, Jailer for the Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish who was on duty April 19th and 20th, 1964, appeared as a witness for the defendants. On cross-examination, the following testimony was adduced:

> "Q. Mr. Bonstaff, I have one question before the Jury goes upstairs. I talked to you in the jail about ten days or two weeks ago. Do you remember telling me that the Jury was not going to find these defendants guilty?
>
> "A. No, I don't tell you that.
>
> "Q. Didn't you tell me that?
>
> "A. No, I don't tell you that."

Counsel for the defendants contended that the above testimony was grossly irrelevant, immaterial, improper examination, and an obvious attempt on the part of the State to try to impeach the credibility of a witness in a grossly improper manner.

The trial court stated, "The Court will instruct the Jury to disregard this question and this answer by the witness, and will deny the defense counsel's request for a mistrial."

Under the circumstances connected with the reserving

of the instant bill, we do not find that the defendants suffered prejudice. The trial judge properly instructed the jury; he corrected any mistake made by the State in the cross-examination. Our discussion of Bills of Exceptions Nos. 44 and 45 applies to the instant bill. No further discussion is necessary.

Bill of Exceptions No. 49 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 50 was reserved when the trial judge refused to delete references to general criminal intent in his charge to the jury.

The statement objected to by counsel for the defendants recited, "General criminal intent is present whenever there is specific intent, and also when the circumstances indicate that the offender in the ordinary course of human experience must have adverted to the prescribed criminal consequences as reasonably certain to result from his act or failure to act."

Counsel for the defendants contend that a charge as to general criminal intent was not applicable to the case, but only specific intent, and, accordingly, when the trial court charged the jury with respect to what was not specific intent (evidently meaning general intent), the latter portion of the charge which followed the instruction as to specific intent was inapplicable and should not have been given. It is contended that the trial judge committed error.

We have read the trial judge's charge to the jury and find that no reversible error was committed by the reference to general criminal intent. The statement objected to was included in a paragraph which also described specific criminal intent. The statement with respect to general criminal intent was a differentiation from specific criminal

intent. The entire paragraph was therefore a definition of criminal intent, which was properly recited. LSA-R.S. 14:10.

Bill of Exceptions No. 50 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 51 was reserved when the trial judge denied and refused to give Special Charges Nos. 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 21.

Defense counsel contend that the denial of the special charges by the trial court constituted prejudicial error. They further contend that a consideration by the jury of the law embodied in the special charges was essential in order to accord defendants a fair and impartial trial and due process under the federal and state constitutions.

Special Charge No. 3 treated of negligent homicide. Counsel requested that the trial judge instruct the jury with respect to the law of negligent homicide and criminal negligence.

We find that the trial judge was correct in refusing to give Special Charge No. 3. Negligent homicide was not a responsive verdict under the instant indictment. It is also a separate and distinct offense. See, LSA-R.S. 14:32 and 14:12.

Special Charges Nos. 5 and 21 treated of the credibility of witnesses and of the appreciation of the jury of the witnesses' testimony.

We find that the trial judge covered the matter set forth in Special Charges Nos. 5 and 21 in his general charge. The trial judge is not required to give a special charge where matter contained in such charge has already been given in general charge. State v. Bickham, 239 La.

1094, 121 So. 2d 207, cert. denied, 364 U.S. 874, 81 S. Ct. 123, 5 L. Ed. 2d 98.

Special Charges Nos. 10, 11 and 12 treated in great part of arrest. This was a matter involving a question of law, addressed to the trial judge for decision. He properly refused to give the instant special charges to the jury.

Special Charges Nos. 9 and 13 treated of confessions, admissions, and statements. This matter was covered in detail in the trial judge's general charge. LSA-R.S. 15:390.

Special Charge No. 16 concerned informers and the self-interest of witnesses. The same matter was practically covered in Special Charge No. 6, which was given to the jury.

We find no abuse of discretion by the trial judge in refusing to give Special Charges Nos. 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 21. His per curiam sets forth the correctness of his ruling:

> "The Court rejected the special charges numbered 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 21, because same were already fully covered in its general written charge, or were matters which the jury should not receive as pertaining to the guilt or innocence of the defendants. * * *"

Bill of Exceptions No. 51 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 52 was reserved when the trial judge refused to grant defendants a mistrial on the ground that a remark made by the District Attorney in rebuttal argument on behalf of the State was improper and prejudicial to the defense.

During the course of rebuttal argument, the District Attorney stated:

> "I will agree with one thing—one thing that was said—I will agree with this, 'A picture is worth ten thousand words.' I had a lot of pictures and you all couldn't see them."

After defense counsel objected to the above remark, we find from the record that the trial judge instructed the jury as follows:

> "You Gentlemen of the Jury will disregard that statement as to pictures you did not see. Any evidence that was excluded during the process of this trial are not to be considered by you in any manner, shape or form, and the statement of the District Attorney is (Inaudible)—they are to be disregarded by you. The Court will deny of course the motion for a mistrial in view of this statement to disregard."

We are of the opinion that the instruction of the trial court had the effect of erasing from the minds of the jury any prejudice that may have been produced by the District Attorney's remark. The general rule is that instruction of the court at the proper time nullifies the prejudicial effect of an improper statement made by a prosecuting officer during the course of the trial. State v. Dowdy, 217 La. 773, 47 So. 2d 496.

Bill of Exceptions No. 52 is without merit.

Bill of Exceptions No. 53 was reserved when the trial judge denied defendants' motion to set aside the verdict and for a new trial.

The motion supra alleges that the trial judge committed error in his rulings on the bills of exceptions we have previously treated. No further discussion of these matters is necessary.

New errors advanced in Articles 33, 37 and 38 of the motion for a new trial are as follows:

"33.

"Error was committed when the defendants were not present at the time that the jury went outside the courtroom to the parking lot adjoining the courthouse to view Defendants' Exhibit 22 [1963 Corvan Panel Truck]."

"37.

"Error in these proceedings was committed when the jury was permitted to examine the jail facilities in the Avoyelles Parish Courthouse during the course of the trial outside the presence of the defendants; especially is this true because of the District Attorney's statements in closing argument regarding toilet."

"38.

"Error was committed by the District Attorney during his closing argument when, among other things, he made the following statements to the jury:

> "'And this security, Gentlemen of the Jury, this security in the jail—that's too big a joke to even discuss. I want to ask you this—you all looked in that jail cell—and I don't like to mention that with ladies present, and this large a crowd in the courtroom, but did you all see a toilet in there? These men had to go to the toilet from the time that they got in there Sunday morning until sometime Monday morning—I feel certain. You don't think they'd let them out?"

"Error in this regard was committed because the District Attorney knew and had been informed that on April 19th, 20th and 21st and at all times from said dates up until a short time prior to the trial of this case, there was, in fact, a toilet in the cell occupied by the defendants on April 19th, 20th and 21st, 1964; these remarks were prejudicial;

counsel for defendants did not learn, until after verdict, of the facts as they actually existed on April 19, 20 and 21 in 1964."

The record discloses that John C. Hopewell, Jr., a photographer employed by the Alexandria Daily Town Talk, testified to the effect that he made some photographs of a red panel truck, evidence involved in this prosecution. At the time he was giving his testimony, the truck itself was located outside of the courthouse. The following colloquy took place between counsel and the trial court:

"BY MR. ROY: Due to the fact that both the State and the Defense have agreed that the best evidence is the truck, and it's outside, I submit that these pictures should not be introduced because they are not the best evidence, and the best evidence is to go out there and look at the truck—again some of these pictures through the use of light and shadows I would think could grossly exaggerate some of the things on the truck, and I think the Jury ought to go out there and look at the truck—that's the best evidence—it's here, and these pictures are secondary evidence and they should not be admitted.

"BY MR. GRAVEL: Your Honor, as I stated before we brought the truck here for the purpose of the Jury seeing it, but for the record it is necessary, we believe, to make the filings—

"BY THE COURT: The Court will permit the filings and their viewing by the Jury.

"BY MR. GRAVEL: I'm going to pass these around—the first one for the Jury's information, 'Defendant's Exhibit 13' they have already viewed but I'm going to keep them in sequence and start with Mr. Normand and just let them see the entire series.

"BY THE COURT: All right.

"* * *

"MR. GRAVEL: I object to that, he's testified as to—the truck is outside that we brought here for the Jury to see and we have no objections to them seeing it. The photographs were made both for the purpose of having them at time of argument and also for the record and I object to any further interrogation as being irrelevant and immaterial about the truck outside..

"* * *

"MR. ROY: Judge, I again ask that the Jury be allowed to go look at that dent, go look at that truck right now, let's find out if this is accurate or let the witness go out and look at the truck right now and come back and answer that question.

"MR. GRAVEL: I move that the Jury be permitted to examine the truck at this time, Your Honor.

"BY THE COURT: Yes, I would like to talk with you gentlemen before they go, you two attorneys.

"BY THE COURT: We will go down and look at the truck. I'll go along, the Sheriff will go along also, the District Attorney, the Clerk and the Defense Attorneys. Don't ask any questions, none of us can tell you anything, we can't give anything because what we do would have to be recorded, so you can look around, you can go on all sides, each of you see it for yourselves, don't discuss it, don't call others to see anything, just each of you see what you want to see. Later on when you deliberate on the case you can call each others attention or whatever you saw and so on, but I want to explain that we can't give testimony outside, we can't ask questions outside, the Attorneys can't make any speeches or even the Court—you understand. I shall accompany you all with the Sheriff, the Clerk and the Attorneys on both sides and we will go down and look at it, after which we will recess for the noon hour and you are under your same instructions.

"COURT RECESSED"

We find that the trial judge's per curiam to the instant bill, quoted hereinafter, fully answers defendants' contentions with respect to the jury's viewing the red panel truck and shows the incorrectness of said contentions. The trial judge specifically states that the defendants and other spectators looked through the windows of the courtroom and watched the examination of the truck on the parking lot downstairs. We conclude that the defendants' looking through the windows was the equivalent of their being present at the examination.

After the examination of the truck, the court entertained a recess for lunch. Court later convened, and Lionel Bonstaff, Jailer with the Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, gave his testimony with respect to jail conditions and the events which occurred in the jail itself. After the District Attorney questioned the witness, the following colloquy took place:

> "BY MR. GRAVEL: Your Honor, in connection with the testimony of this witness the defendants request of the Court that the Jury be permitted to see the cell where these defendants were, and have without making any statement have Mr. Bonstaff demonstrate how he opens and closes that particular cell door. They will know and be able to visualize and see the cell and the area adjacent thereto.
>
> "BY MR. ROY: Your Honor, before you rule on this the State certainly has no objection to the Jury going up to the jail, as a matter of fact we would want them to go up but this is a very obvious attempt to impeach the testimony of Reverend Bell who is not here to defend himself. I would like to ask the Court to withhold allowing the Jury to go up there. If this man can demonstrate such things

I'd like to have Reverend Bell here to be able to demontrate things to the Jury too, then we will all go up there.

"BY MR. GRAVEL: Reverend Bell didn't even know which cell they were in.

"BY MR. ROY: He can show which one he was in—

"BY MR. GRAVEL: I'm not here to argue that, I think that the request in the light of the testimony of this witness and as part of the defense of this case we request—the request is one that certainly should be made—we do make it on behalf of the defendants, and ask Your Honor to grant the request.

"BY THE COURT: I think we can work that out some time before it goes to the Jury.

"BY MR. GRAVEL: Your Honor, I'd like to do that now, please, if I may.

"BY THE COURT: I would have to have a conference with you gentlemen, there's some complications there that I don't know how to work out at this time.

"BY MR. GRAVEL: I believe I can anticipate them, may we approach the bench?

"BY THE COURT: Yes.

"* * *

"BY MR. GRAVEL: Yes, sir, by reference make it part of the record, and by reference refer to it as 'Defendant's Exhibit 22' [red Corvan Panel Truck inspected by the jury]—by reference I also make part of the record 'Defendant's Exhibit 23'—the jail. I think that's proper, Your Honor, when the Jury does view something outside of the Courtroom." (We presume that the jury had examined the jail cell at the time of counsel's statement.)

A reading of the testimony of record discloses that the testimony of the witnesses was contradictory with respect to the security and physical conditions, appearance, appurtenances, and visibility of the jail cell occupied by the defendants on Monday, April 20, 1964.[13]

Defense counsel requested that the jury examine the jail cell, and counsel for the State was in accord. We gather that it was the purpose of counsel to let the jury see for itself the cell occupied by the defendants on April 20, 1964, and then make its own decision as to the credibility of the witnesses' testimony with respect thereto.

Defendants were present when all testimony was adduced. Defendants heard Rev. Bell testify that they were visible to him. They heard other witnesses testify as to steel doors, grill work, and maximum security. Defendants themselves occupied the cell on April 20, 1964.

After requesting that the jury examine the jail cell, counsel for the defendants agreed to all conditions imposed by the trial judge. They did not ask that the defendants view the cell in the company of the jury.

Since the appearance of the jail cell and its viewing had to do with the credibility of the witnesses as to their recollection of the cell's physical condition, we find that the defendants were not prejudiced by not being present at the inspection. The viewing of the cell had nothing to do with examining the scene of the commission of the crime or with evidence associated with the commission thereof.

---

[13] We find the following stipulation in the testimony taken on the motion for a new trial: "It is stipulated between the defense and the prosecution that there were toilet facilities in the cell occupied by the defendants on April 19th., 20th., 21st., 1964 and that these facilities were removed sometime—short time prior to the trial and in 1965."

We conclude that the presence of defendants was not necessary, and that the rule that one who is tried for a felony must be personally present in court at every important stage of the trial from the moment of his arraignment to his sentence was not violated herein. Cf. State v. Futrell, 159 La. 1093, 106 So. 651; State v. Pepper, 189 La. 795, 180 So. 640; State v. Breedlove, 199 La. 965, 7 So. 2d 221.

We do not find that the trial judge committed reversible error in denying the instant motion. His per curiam fully explains his reasons as follows:

> "This bill refers to the jury viewing the truck offered in evidence and a certain jail cell in the Parish jail, without being accompanied by the defendants. No objection was made at the time; counsel for defendants waived their clients' presence. Counsel for defendants wanted the jury to go see the truck parked outside the Courthouse, on the Courthouse parking lot. The Courthouse is on the third floor. The Court called a conference of the District Attorney and counsel for defendants. I stated that if we could agree on when this would be done and who was to go with the jury, I would arrange a visit to the truck, on the parking lot, by the jury. The attorneys for both sides were called up to my desk. It was agreed that just before the noon recess, the jury, the attorneys for both sides, the Court, the Clerk of Court and the deputies in charge of the jury would walk down the stairs and view the truck. It was further agreed that all others, spectators, etc., would be removed from the area; that there was to be no talking or questions asked about the case or about the truck. That after viewing the truck in this manner, the jury would be released to the Sheriff's custody for their noon day meal, without returning to the Courtroom. It is the Court's recollection *that the defendants* and other spectators *looked through the windows of the Courtroom to*

watch the examination of the truck on the parking lot downstairs.

"As for the jail cell, the same procedure was followed. Attorneys for both sides were called to the bench and agreed to let the jury go upstairs (4th floor) from the 3rd floor, without the defendants accompanying them, but with the attorneys, the Court, the deputies in charge and the clerk. They were to march or walk up a stairway and there was to be no questioning or testimony of any kind during the visit.

"On both occasions, Court was recessed for the purpose and on both occasions the procedure was agreed to by the attorneys for the defendants and the district attorney and never was there any objection to the procedure by anyone. The matter was raised for the first time in the Motion for a New Trial.

"REASON: We were operating in crowded quarters. The Court wanted to keep the jury separate and apart from the defendants and the courtroom spectators. The narrow stairways, crowded jail, etc., would have made it impossible to separate the jury from the defendants. All the sheriff's force, except two deputies were under the rule as witnesses in the case and this was the only way the visits could be arranged. The problems involved were pointed out to the attorneys by the Court, at the bench, privately, before the viewing visits, and all agreed to same as proposed, beforehand, and without objection." (Emphasis ours.)

The authorities relied upon by counsel for defendants are not apposite.

Bill of Exceptions No. 53 is without merit.

For the reasons assigned, the conviction and sentence are affirmed.

APPENDIX "B"

TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
PARISH OF AVOYELLES
STATE OF LOUISIANA

—oOo—

EXTRACTS OF COURT MINUTES

—oOo—

The Minutes of August 19, 1965 of the Twelfth Judicial District Court, in and for the Parish of Avoyelles, State of Louisiana, were entered, read and approved as follows:

—oOo—

CRIMINAL DOCKET NO: 21,822
STATE OF LOUISIANA
VERSUS
JOE A. WOODARD, &
JOHN T. HOPPER

MANSLAUGHTER

This cause came on this day pursuant to regular assignment. Both defendants were present in Court accompanied by counsel; the district attorney and his assistant, Chris J. Roy, representing the State of Louisiana, were present in Court; both the State and the defense, through counsel, announced ready and in the presence of the defendants, their counsel, the district attorney and his assistant, on behalf of the said defendants, a Motion For New Trial and a Motion In Arrest Of Judgment were filed; evidence adduced on Motion For New Trial, motions argued and submitted and after considering the law and the evidence and the argument of counsel, the Motion For A New Trial was denied by the Court, to which ruling of the Court counsel

for defendants objected and reserved a bill of exceptions; Motion In Arrest Of Judgment was denied by the Court, to which ruling of the Court counsel for defendants objected and reserved a bill of exceptions. The Court then announced that it was ready to pass sentence upon the defendants, they having been previously found guilty of manslaughter on July 16, 1965, whereupon the defendants rose and were each sentenced to serve a term of FIFTY-NINE (59) MONTHS at hard labor in the Louisiana State Penitentiary at Angola and to pay the costs of the prosecution or trial herein. In view of the sentence this day imposed upon the defendants, the Court permitted their release from custody, pending their appeal to the Supreme Court of Louisiana, upon their furnishing bond in the sum of $5,000.00 each, and said bond was this day filed in open Court, with the Sheriff.

—oOo—

ORDERED COURT ADJOURN

APPROVED BY:
s/ Earl Edwards
JUDGE

—oOo—

STATE OF LOUISIANA :
PARISH OF AVOYELLES :

—oOo—

CERTIFICATE

—oOo—

I, SHIRLEY B. MOREAU, Court Reporter & Deputy Clerk of Court of the Twelfth Judicial District Court, in and for the Parish of Avoyelles, State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and exact excerpt of the Minutes of August 19, 1965, of the said Court; that said ruling was handed down by the Honorable Earl Edwards, Judge, and that the entry upon the record of this Court was approved by him.

MARKSVILLE, Louisiana, August 20, 1965.

s/ Shirley B. Moreau
COURT REPORTER &
DEPUTY CLERK

—oOo—

APPENDIX "C"

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. ....., October Term, 1967

JOHN T. HOPPER AND JOE A. WOODARD,
Petitioners,

vs.

LOUISIANA

ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

UPON CONSIDERATION of the application of counsel for petitioner(s),

IT IS ORDERED that the time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari in the above-entitled cause be, and the same is hereby, extended to and including April 4, 1968.

/s/ Hugo L. Black
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States

Dated this 27th
day of January, 1968.

SUPREME COURT, U. S.

JUN 5 1968

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

No. 1291

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Respondent,

v.

JOHN T. HOPPER AND JOE A. WOODARD,
Defendants-Petitioners.

STATE OF LOUISIANA'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

JACK P. F. GREMILLION,
Attorney General for the
State of Louisiana.

WILLIAM P. SCHULER,
Second Asst. Attorney General.

HARRY H. HOWARD,
Assistant Attorney General.

LAWRENCE L. McNAMARA,
Special Counsel.

INDEX

	PAGE
I. OPINION BELOW	2
II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
III. RESPONSE TO APPLICATION	
PART I	5
PART II	12
PART III	16
PART IV	19
PART V	26

Table of Authorities

LOUISIANA STATUTES

R.S. 14:30	28
R.S. 15:316	12
R.S. 15:317	13
R.S. 15:441	28
R.S. 15:445	28
L.R.S. 15:450	16

Cases

Ashley v. Texas, 310 F.2d 80, 83	8
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 87	8
Brinegar v. U.S., 338 U.S. 160	23
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1, 3, 86 S.Ct. 1245, 1246 16 L.Ed.2d 314	15
Clark v. State, 370 P.2d 46 (Okla.)	12

PAGE

Delli Paoli v. United States, 352 U.S. 232 (1957) .. 16

Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478 (1964) 25

Jackson v. Denno, 378 U.S. 368 (1964) 15

Johnson v. State of New Jersey, 384 U.S. 719, 86 S.Ct. 1772 25

Jenkins v. State, 136 So.2d 580 12

Katz v. U.S., 88 S.Ct. 507 (1967) 18

Macon v. Commonwealth, 46 S.E.2d 396 12

Massiah v. U.S., 377 U.S. 207, 84 S.Ct. 1199 (1964) 18

Maund v. State, 254 Ala. 452, 84 So.2d 553 12

Mertler v. State, 97 N.E. 2d 492 (Ind.) 12

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966) 25

Napue v. People of State of Illinois, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S.Ct. 1173 8

Opper v. U.S., 384 U.S. 84, 75 S.Ct. 158 16

People v. Aranda, 12 C2d 307, 83 P.2d 928 15

Pointer v. State of Texas, 380 U.S. 400, 403, 85 S.Ct. 1065, 1068, 13 L.Ed. 923 15

Pribyl v. State, 87 N.W.2d 201, 185 Neb. 691 12

Robertson v. Commonwealth, 269 Ky. 317, 107 S.W.2d 292 12

Smith v. State of Illinois, 88 S.Ct. 748 (1968) 15

State v. Aguirre, 167 Kan. 266, 206 P.2d 118 12

State v. Bourg, 248 La. 844, 182 So.2d 510 (1966) 23

PAGE

State v. Breedlove, 199 La. 965, 7 So.2d 221 32

State v. Corneille, 153 La. 929, 96 So. 813 17

State v. Davidson, 248 La. 161, 177 So.2d 273.... 24

State v. Davis, 164 So.2d 589 12

State v. Fontenot, 48 La.Ann 283, 19 So. 113 17

State v. Foster, 153 La. 154, 94 So. 1536 17

State v. Fulthum, 242 La. 767, 138 So.2d 569 (1962) app. dism. 371 U.S. 5 (1962) 29

State v. Furtrell, 159 La. 1093, 106 So. 651 32

State v. Garon, 161 La.867, 109 So. 530 17

State v. Green, 150 So.2d 571, 244 La. 80 22

State v. Hamilton, 249 La. 392, 187 So.2d 417 (1966), at p. 421 27

State v. Hughes, 29 La.Ann 514 17

State v. Johnson, 249 La. 950, 192 So.2d 137 (1966) 23, 24

State v. Lyle, 125 S.C. 406, 118 S.E. 803 12

State v. Mack, 243 La. 369, 144 So.2d 363, (1962) cert. denied, 373 U.S. 917, 83 S.Ct. 1306, 10 L.Ed.2d 416 13

State v. Marchetti, 247 La. 649, 173 So.2d 531.. 22, 24

State v. McCollum, 135 La. 432, 65 So. 600 17

State v. Morgan, 211 La. 572, 30 So.2d 434 (1947) 27

State v. Morris, 245 La. 175, 157 So.2d 728 (1963) 27

State v. Pepper, 189 La. 795, 180 So. 642 32

PAGE

State v. Progue, 243 La. 337, 144 So.2d 352 (1962) 13

State v. Spillers, 105 La. 163, 29 So. 480 17

State v. Stiltner, 61 Wash.2d 102, 377 P.2d 252.. 12

State of Louisiana v. John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard, 251 La. 77, 203 So. 222 (1967)..... 2

People v. Waterman, 9 N.Y.(2) 561, 565; 216 N.Y. S(2) 70, 75; 175 NE(2) 445, 448 18

No._____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Respondent,

v.

JOHN T. HOPPER AND JOE A. WOODARD,
Defendants-Petitioners.

STATE OF LOUISIANA'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Respondent hereby moves this Honorable Court to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana entered in the above entitled case.

OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

Respondent, the State of Louisiana, pursuant to Rule 24 of the Revised Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States opposes the petition of John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard, filed herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Louisiana on the ground that the petition does not raise a substantial federal question. Petitioners' convictions of manslaughter resulted only after full compliance of the requirements of Louisiana and Federal law, and

neither petitioners suffered a violation of any constitutional or statutory right. No issue of a substantial federal question, not previously decided by this Honorable Court, was raised or determined by the Supreme Court of Louisiana in the instant case. Nor has such an issue been decided in any manner at variance with the decisions of this Honorable Court.

I. OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Louisiana Supreme Court is reported in *State of Louisiana v. John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard*, 251 La. 77, 203 So.2d 222 (1967) and is reproduced in petitioners' application as appendix A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Defendants, John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard, were tried for the murder of Joseph Ralph Beeson on April 19, 1964 in Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana by beating the said Joseph Ralph Beeson to death.

The two Defendants were college students in Ruston, Louisiana. The Defendants left college in Ruston on April 18, 1964 in the company of one R. W. Frazier and Charlie Gaharan and traveled by an automobile owned and operated by one of the Defendants, Joe A. Woodard toward Marksville, in Avoyelles Parish. They checked in at the Ranch House Motel, which is located on Louisiana Highway 1. Shortly thereafter they made an appearance at the Pelican Club

in Marksville (at about 8:00 P.M.) where they participated in the entertainment and activity offered by the club until about 1:30 A. M. on April 19, 1964. When the band had stopped playing, the Defendants walked out of the Club and the decedent, Joseph Ralph Beeson, was among them. Upon reaching the Northeast corner of the club, and about midway to the East side of a concrete slab where a red panel truck was parked, an argument ensued between the Defendant, John T. Hopper and the decedent, Joseph Ralph Beeson. The argument became heated and the decedent Beeson found himself surrounded by Defendants Hopper and Woodard who weigh approximately 180 pounds and 215 pounds respectively, and who started to move in on the decedent Beeson, who weighed approximately 141 pounds. In attempting flight, the decedent threw a high ball glass at the Defendant Hopper, but before he could escape, he was seized and held from the rear by the Defendant Woodard, permitting Hopper to strike Beeson about the face and chest area until he was knocked senseless. Beeson was then thrown to the ground and both Defendants, Woodard and Hopper proceeded to beat, kick and stomp the life out of the helpless and defenseless Beeson. Upon seeing blood flow from the nose, mouth and ears of Beeson, the Defendants ran from the area. Woodard ran to his automobile, parked nearby, and Hopper called to Billy Frazier to get Charlie Gaharan who was still in the Pelican Club. The four drove off and returned to the Ranch House Motel, driving in a

long round about way in fear of pursuit.

Two friends of Beeson, Winston Miller and Jerry Morrison, who had been waiting for Beeson then realized that he was involved in an altercation with Hopper and Woodard. They attempted to assist their friend but were stopped momentarily by Charlie Frazier, who was about 75 feet away from the scene of the altercation. After being delayed momentarily by Frazier, Miller and Morrison arrived on the scene and found Joseph Ralph Beeson in the condition stated above. Jerry Morrison got the license number of the escaping automobile which was subsequently traced and determined to be owned by one of the Defendants, Woodard. The police arrived and although suspecting that Beeson was already dead, he was sent to the Marksville Hospital where his death was confirmed.

After determining the ownership of the automobile and the motel in which the owner was staying, police chief Dubea and officer DeNux of the Marksville police knocked on the slightly open door of cabin 9, opposite to where Woodard's automobile was parked. The officers were invited in, whereupon Woodard admitted that he owned the automobile, that he had been to the Pelican Club and had been in a fight. Chief Dubea then informed Woodard that the boy had died and Woodard's response was "I knew we had given him a good beating, but I didn't think we had killed him." Chief Dubea then advised Woodard that he was under arrest and to go along with him, where they were taken to the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's office. Chief Dubea and Deputy

Sheriff Bordelon returned to the Motel to pick up Hopper. However, two State Troopers, Pat Lemoin and Eddie Bordelon had already picked up the radio call and arrived at the Ranch House Motel, found Hopper and informed him that the Beeson boy was dead. Hopper's response was "My God, what have we done". The State Troopers had taken Hopper in custody and brought him to the Sheriff's office in Marksville. En route to the Sheriff's office, the Defendant Hopper, told the officers that they had killed Beeson, "I guess, because we were drinking". Oral confessions were made by both Defendants which were offered and admitted into evidence.

On April 21, 1964 the Defendants were released on Bond. On May 22, 1964 the Grand Jury indicted the Defendants for murder and the trial of this cause commenced in June of 1965. The jury returned a verdict of manslaughter as to both defendants on July 16, 1965 and were each sentenced to fifty-nine months at hard labor on August 19, 1965.

Defendants appealed to the Supreme Court of Louisiana on November 2, 1965. The Louisiana Supreme Court upheld the conviction of Defendants in an opinion rendered June 5, 1967. Application for a rehearing was denied. Petition for writ of certiorari was docketed in this Honorable Court on April 4, 1968.

Response to Petitioners' Part I. Prosecutor's Conduct

To paraphrase the almost Petitioners' own words, what is involved here is the credibility of the witness,

Rev. Bell and the question of the alleged suppression of evidence by the prosecution.

Rev. John E Bell, a Methodist Minister of the Gospel, visited the Parish Jail on the morning of April 20, 1964 and testified before the Jury that during a conversation between the Defendants and an unidentified third person he heard defendant Woodard make the statement "I wish to hell I had time to stomp some more to death". Petitioners contend that Rev. Bell could not have seen or identified the petitioner Woodard because of physical conditions of the jail, and more particularly, the cell involved, and whether there were or were not toilets in the cell during the time the defendants were there incarcerated. Further, the cell door was to have been kept closed at all times.

Petitioners supposedly learned, subsequent to the trial, that insofar as the toilets were concerned, the toilets were in the cell in which the defendants were confined at the time of Rev. Bell's visit to the jail.

Petitioners urges that this complaint became aggravated when the District Attorney referred to Rev. Bell's testimony in his closing-rebuttal argument and when defendants were subsequently denied a motion for a new trial; that Defendants rights were denied under the Fourteenth Amendment. To lend support to petitioners' argument, petitioners call attention to the fact that the prosecutor displayed to the jury clothing of one defendant and a model, both of which had theretofore been excluded from the evidence; that

the District Attorney was a witness and testified several times during the trial; and that the Prosecutor declined to testify when he was called by the defendants in connection with the hearing on the Motion to Supress—all to show that "the prosecutor had a personal interest in the prosecution in conflict with the fair administration of justice".

Petitioners fail to note, however, in their "Statement of Facts" that Rev. Bell was subjected to cross-examination; that other witnesses testified as to the steel doors, grill work and maximum security policies of the jail; that on motion of the defense, the pertinent cell was viewed by the jury; and not the least important, the unidentified party referred to by Rev. Bell, happened to be one Billy Frazier, who was called by the defense and who testified that he did not hear the statement attributed to defendant Woodard. Therefore, contradictory testimony was much in evidence, and the question resolves itself merely to the credibility of the witnesses and the weight of the evidence in connection therewith as determined by the jury.

As to the suppression of evidence by the prosecution, that it had knowledge that the toilets were removed from the cell in which defendants were confined subsequent to the visit to the jail by Rev. Bell is certainly not borne out by the record in this case. It is submitted this contention is supported by the stipulation made between the defense and the prosecution at the time of defendants' motion for a new trial.

The stipulation referred to is quoted below as noted in the Opinion of the Supreme Court of Louisiana (Application A-74):

> "It is stipulated between the defense and the prosecution that there were toilet facilities in the cell occupied by the defendants on April 19, 20th and 21st, 1964 and that these facilities were removed some time-short time prior to the trial and in 1965."

Therefore, it is submitted that the action of the District Attorney is clearly without that conduct proscribed by *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 and *Ashley v. Texas*, 310 F. 2d. 80, 83, relied upon by petitioners. Nor did the prosecuting attorney allow the question of whether there were or were not toilets in defendant's cell at the time of Rev. Bell's visit to go uncorrected. *Napue v. Illinois*, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S. Ct. 1173.

Petitioners show that the jury was permitted to inspect the maximum security cell and by way of criticism called attention to this Honorable Court that "the two defendants, however, were not present at this time and therefore did not see what the jury had seen". What petitioners failed to note is that the jury view was made at the urging of petitioners who shared in the conditions under which the jury view was permitted by the Court. Counsel for defendants did not request or suggest as a condition that the defendants view the cell in the company of the jury. In fact it is submitted that the per curiam by the trial judge clearly illustrates the concern of the Court for

the proper conduct of the trial, as quoted in full by the Louisiana Supreme Court in its opinion (Application A-76) which we quote here in part:

> "REASON: We were operating in crowded quarters. The Court wanted to keep the jury separate and apart from the defendants and the courtroom spectators. The narrow stairways, crowded jail, etc. would have made it impossible to separate the jury from the defendants. All the sheriff's force, except two deputies were under the rule as witnesses in the case and this was the only way the visits could be arranged. The problems involved were pointed out to the attorneys by the Court, at the bench, privately, before the viewing visits, and all agreed to same as proposed, beforehand, and without objection".

Petitioners' criticism of the remarks to the jury made by the District Attorney when referring to a certain model is raised for the first time in their Application. It is submitted that the objection and request of defense counsel to instruct the jury to disregard the said remarks was immediately recognized by the Trial Court when it observed:

> "That's true, gentlemen, you are to disregard the statement, Only the evidence that is admitted in the case is to be considered by you. The statement here about the exhibit that he withdrew from the evidence is not to be given any consideration whatsoever." (See record, p. 3748-3749):

As to the clothing of one defendant displayed to the jury in connection with the questioning of a witness, the witness Mr. Frazier was asked, "Mr.

Frazier, are these the pants and shirt that Joe Woodard was wearing that night?" Counsel for defendants immediately objected and the State withdrew the evidence, the jury was retired and counsel argued about the evidence, it being the contention of defense counsel that the clothing had already been excluded by the Court as evidence as a result of which he moved for a mistrial which was denied by the Trial Court. At page 3713 of the transcript of Vol. 17 the defense counsel stated as follows:

> "Your Honor, in your per curiam may I suggest that your Honor indicate the manner which these were presented to the jury. They were not in a sealed package of any kind".

The Court had previously excluded a sealed package as evidence. To the statement made by defendants' counsel, the Court replied as follows, quoting from the same page: (Application A-61.)

> "Yes, sir, I will have to because I can say in the presence of the jury, you intimated that's the same ones I had excluded and certainly I had no way of knowing that—maybe they are and maybe they are not—I wouldn't say that in front of the jury, but I can say it here and I will make the proper notation when the per curiam is prepared in connection with the Bill. Yes, sir."

If there was no per curiam attached to the Bill of Exception, the Supreme Court noted in its opinion that the trial judge properly instructed the jury.

As stated heretofore, petitioners attempt to show

"personal interest in the prosecution" because of the fact that the District Attorney testified as a witness several times for the State.

The Supreme Court of Louisiana, considering the Bill of Exceptions relating thereto, found no prejudice, or reversible error, quoting in part from the Court's opinion (Application A-45):

> "Under the facts of this prosecution as disclosed by the testimony attached to the bills of exceptions, it was necessary that the District Attorney testify. He had a peculiar knowledge of what took place on the morning the offense was committed. It was really necessary that he testify in order for the defendants to have a fair and impartial trial. A foundation was properly laid for the introduction of exhibits. We also find that the testimony of the District Attorney was explanatory rather than impeaching. With respect to Bill of Exceptions No. 48, we note that the trial judge explicitly told the jury to disregard completely certain testimony which was sought to be elicited in rebuttal."
>
> "We find that the trial judge had to exercise his discretion in this matter, and under its peculiar facts and circumstances he was constrained to permit the District Attorney to testify. We do not find that he abused his discretion. No authority which absolutely prohibits a district attorney from testifying in a prosecution which he is conducting has been pointed out to us. Counsel for the defendants have not shown that defendants suffered any prejudice from the testimony of the District Attorney. We find no reversible error".

It is submitted that a prosecuting attorney is competent to testify in the discretion of the Court.

Pribyl v. State, 87 N.W. 2d 201, 185 Neb. 691; *Clark v. State*, 370, P. 2d 46, (Oklahoma); *State v. Lyle*, 125 S. Carolina, 406, 118, S. E. 803; *Robertson v. Commonwealth*, 269 Kentucky 317; 107 S. W. 2d 292; *State v. Aguirre* 167 Kansas 266, 206 P. 2d 118; *Maund v. State*, 254 Alabama 452, 48 So. 2d 553; *State v. Stiltner*, 61 Wash. 2d 102, 377 P. 2d 252; *Mertler v. State*, 97 N.E. 2d 492 (Indiana)

The following cases cited by petitioners have no application here: In *State v. Davis*, 164 So. 2d 589, the District Attorney was merely a spectator at a trial until he testified as a witness: in *Macon v. Commonwealth* 46 S.E. 2d 396 the District Attorney was criticized by his method of questioning; in *Jenkins v. State*, 136 So. 2d 580, it appears that the District Attorney was *the* prosecuting witness.

It is submitted, that the rulings of the trial court permitting the District Attorney to testify as a witness in those instances criticized by petitioners were a just and proper exercise of the discretionary powers of the trial judge, and were not prejudicial to the constitutional rights of the defendants, and were properly affirmed by the Louisiana Supreme Court.

Response to Petitioners' Part II. Severance

Petitioners acknowledge that at the time of trial of the defendants Louisiana law provided in LRS-15:316:

> "Persons jointly indicted shall be jointly tried, unless the District Attorneys elect to place such persons separately upon trial, or unless the Court, on motion of defendant, shall, after a hearing contradictory with the District Attorney, order a severance."

In the State of Louisiana severance is not a matter of right and the granting or refusing of severance is vested in the sole discretion of the trial judge whose ruling will not be interferred with unless manifestly erroneous and injurious to the accused. *State v. Progue*, 243 La. 337, 144 So. 2d 352 (1962) and *State v. Mack* 243 La. 369, 144 So. 2d 262 (1962). Cert. denied by the United States Supreme Court, 83 S. Ct. 1306, 373 U.S. 917, 10 L. Ed. 2d 416.

The Louisiana Supreme Court in its opinion (Application A-32 & A-33) held as follows:

> "The reasons set out by counsel for the defendants for the granting of severance were general. At the time the motions were filed, defendants did not show any particular reason for granting severance or that injury would result to either from a joint trial. They did not show with particularity that their defenses were antagonistic; they did not show that their testimony would be contradictory. See *State v. Progue*, 243 La. 337, 144 So. 2d 352. They did not meet the tests which would necessitate severance. See LSA-R.S. 15:316-317.
>
> "We find no abuse of discretion by the trial judge. His charge to the jury adequately protected each defendant. We do not find (and it

has not been shown) that either defendant was arbitrarily affected by the ruling of the trial judge, or that either actually suffered any prejudice from the joint trial itself."

As a footnote to its holding, the Supreme Court listed several instructions to the jury pertinent thereto, which are quoted herein below (Application A-33):

"8. 'All evidence relating to any oral admission or oral confessions or other incriminating statements claimed to have been made by a defendant, outside of Court, should be considered with caution and weighed with great care. And, you, Gentlemen, must be convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that such were freely and voluntarily given.

' * * * *

'And, in the case of a confession, made outside of Court, by one defendant, it should not be considered by the jury as evidence against the other defendant who was not present or not a party to such confession.

' * * * * *

'Although there are two defendants and they are jointly charged with the same crime, it is your duty, Gentlemen, of the Jury, to give separate personal consideration to the case of each individual defendant. When you do so, you should analyze what the evidence shows with respect to that individual, leaving out of consideration, entirely, any evidence admitted solely against some other defendant, each defendant is entitled to have his case determined from his own acts and state-

ments, and the other evidence in the case as may be applicable to him.' "

Petitioners rely principally on the California Supreme Court citing *People v. Aranda*, 12 Cal. 2d 307, 83 P 2d 928 (Application P. 51) but it should be noted that that Court recognized that the rules created therein were not constitutionally compelled because of the absence of a prior holding by the United States Supreme Court, but that their holding was to be considered "judicially declared rules of practice."

The *Jackson v. Denno* case, 378 U. S. 368 (1964) held that a defendant was constitutionally entitled to have a trial judge determine that his confession was voluntary before it was submitted to the trial jury. This practice has long been followed in the State of Louisiana. Petitioners claim that the denial of severance and the introduction of each co-defendants' statements in the course of the trial amounted to a denial of defendants' right of confrontation and cross-examination of a witness under oath in Court. Petitioners cite *Pointer v. State of Texas*, 380 U. S. 400, 403, 85 S. Ct. 1065, 1068, 13 L.Ed. 2d 923; *Brookhart v. Janis*, 384 U. S. 1, 3, 86, S.Ct. 1245, 1246, 16 L.Ed. 2d 314; and *Smith v. State of Illinois*, ... U. S. ....., 88 S.Ct. 748 (1968). However, the *Pointer* case was concerned with the use of a transcript of a witness' testimony at a preliminary hearing; the *Brookhart* case concerns the unusual facts where a defendant did not plead guilty but was alleged to have agreed not to cross-examine

or otherwise challenge any of the State's case; the *Smith* case concerns the testimony of an informer in a narcotics case where this Honorable Court held that the right of cross-examination included the right to ask the informer's correct name and address. None of which we submit have application here.

It is submitted that the holding by the Louisiana Supreme Court is consistent with *Dellipaoli v. United States*, 352 U. S. 232 (1957) where this Honorable Court held that the right of severance rests in the broad discretion of the trial court.

And concluding, petitioners' concern over the confusion of the jury has been answered by Your Honors in *Opper v. United States*, 384 U. S. 84, 75 S. Ct. 158 as follows:

> "Other than the general possibility of confusion, he (defendant) points out nothing specifically prejudicial resulting from the joint trial . . .
>
> "To say that the jury might have been confused amounts to nothing more than an unfounded speculation that the jurors disregarded clear instructions of the court in arriving at their verdict."

Response to Part III. Unreasonable and Unconnected Interception of Conversation

The statement, to the effect, quote, "I wish to hell I had had time to stomp some more to death" attributed to Woodard as part of the testimony overheard by Rev. Bell is criticized on the grounds that it is fragmentary and not an entire statement and

thus prejudicial to the defendants, citing L.R.S. 15:450 which is as follows:

> "Every confession, admission, or declaration sought to be used against anyone must be used in its entirety so that the person to be affected thereby may have the benefit of any exculpation or explanation that the whole statement may afford."

The statement in the instant case is not a fragmentary remark as was found in *State v. Hughes*, 29 La. Ann. 514, but that the statement is complete in itself.

> "The rule as we understand it, is that fragmentary passages of a conversation are excluded, but that a statement in regard to a conversation, which is complete in itself, heard by the witness, is admissible in evidence. The requirement is that the statement given must be complete in itself. It matters not whether it be the whole or only a part of the conversation." *State v. Garon*, 161 La. 867, 109 So. 530 (1926) citing *State v. Fontenot*, 48 La. Ann. 283, 19 So. 113; *State v. Foster*, 153 La. 154, 94 So. 536.

Continuing, the following authorities are also presented: *State v. Corneille*, 153 La. 929, 96 So. 813 (1923); *State v. McCollum*, 135 La. 432, 65 So. 2d 600 (1914); *State v. Spillers*, 105 La. 163, 29 So. 480.

The Louisiana Supreme Court noted in its Opinion (Application A) that the statement by Rev. Bell

was not incomplete but that it expressed a complete thought. The Court also noted that a witness called by the defense, one Billy Frazier, who was the unidentified person referred to by Rev. Bell testified that he did not hear Joe Woodard make the statement attributed to him by Rev. Bell and that therefore the jury had for consideration, the testimony of Frazier and Rev. Bell which was contradictory and defense counsel have not specifically shown the Court how the defendant suffered such prejudice as would warrant reversal. Petitioner also avers that his rights under the Escobedo and Miranda decisions were violated; that he intended his conversation to be private; and that he did not waive his constitutional right to be secured against unreasonable searches or surveillance during his incarceration.

Petitioners rely on *Massiah v. United States*, 377 U.S. 207, 84 S. Ct. 1199 (1964). There the Court held that the petitioner was denied basic rights when federal agents had deliberately elicited words from him after he had been indicted in the absence of counsel and was critical of indirect or supreptitious interrogations, citing a New York case, *People v. Waterman*, 9 N.Y. 2d. 561, 565; 216 N.Y. S 2d 70, 75; 175 NE 2d 445, 448 which critized "secret interrogation". Another case cited by petitioners *Katz v. United States*, 88 S. Ct. 507 (1967) excluded electronically recorded statements of the accused stating that wherever a man may be, he is entitled to know that he will remain free from unreasonable searches and seizures.

It is submitted that in the instant case, Rev. Bell was not a spy or an agent for the government nor was he interrogating the defendant.

It is submitted that the statement by Rev. Bell attributed to defendant Woodard but denied by witness, Billy Frazier, resolves itself to a determination of fact as made by the jury and that no federal questions are here involved.

Response to Part IV. Confessions

A. The first issues raised by petitioners in this part relate to the illegality of the arrest of the petitioners. It is respectfully submitted that the following facts, proved and of record, show clearly that their arrest was legal.

Petitioners contend that they were arrested without warrant or probable cause. The State concedes that a warrant was not issued for their arrest but contends that the facts as revealed by the testimony establish without equivocation that the arrest of petitioners was made under circumstances which would warrant a man of reasonable caution to believe that a felony had been committed and that the petitioners were the perpetrators thereof.

The first news of the offense was received by Reese McNeal, Chief Paul Dubea and Officer DeNux who were in the Sheriff's radio room where Chief Dubea received a call which advised him that a boy had been run over at the Pelican Club and was in serious condition. Whereupon they called for an ambulance and Chief Dubeau and Officer DeNux pro-

ceeded to the Pelican Club. (R. pp. 610-611) On arriving at the club they found a boy lying on a concrete slab in a pool of blood and they were of the opinion that he was probably dead at that time. There was a crowd gathered around and, from the conversation of the members of the crowd, as well as from their own observations, Chief Dubea determined that the boy had been injured as a result of a fight (R. pp. 647, 650, 652). One of the onlookers told Chief Dubea that she had seen three boys jump into a car and leave the scene of the offense. She was able to provide Chief Dubea with the make and color of the automobile as well as the license number thereof (R. pp. 612 and 613).

The two officers left the scene and went to the hospital where it was determined that the boy was dead (R. p. 615). Leaving the hospital, they returned to the Sheriff's Office where they obtained from the State Police the name of the owner of the suspected vehicle (R. p. 616). From the Sheriff's Office they proceeded to the Ranch House Motel where they found, parked, the automobile described by the witness at the scene of the incident. On inspection they found that there was blood in the car. (R. p. 618) There was a small crowd of angry people around the motel. Whereupon they dispersed the crowd, knocked on the door and were admitted in to the motel room (R. p. 620). Upon being admitted to the motel room, Chief Dubea and Officer DeNux found three males and one female present. What occurred is shown by the testimony of Chief Dubea:

"When I knocked they say come on in, we walked in, I don't know who said come in but anyway we walked in and I says 'Mr. Woodard in this room?' and he says 'that's me', he did he was still in bed.

"I said 'is that your car outside?' he said 'yes, sir' I said 'were you in a fight at the Pelican?' he said, 'yes, sir', well I said 'the boy that you all the fight with, he's dead' well he said 'we knew we had give him a good beating but we didn't know we had killed him' I says 'you are under arrest' and one of them says 'what for' and I said 'for murder'. So we come up to the sheriff's office, I brought Woodard, Frazier, what's this other guy's name—*this fellow was married, for*get his name—had his wife, him and his wife, Nobel, well we just brought those three. Hopper, which we later on found out . . . ." (R. p. 621)

The above sets forth the factual situation regarding the arrest of petitioner, Woodard.

Petitioner, Hopper, was also arrested the same night under the following circumstances.

Sergeant Patrick Lemoine and Trooper Eddie Bordelon of the State Police had received a message to be on the lookout for an automobile of the make, color and license number of the vehicle belonging to Woodard. They testified that they understood that the occupants of said vehicle were being hunted because of a murder charge. These officers did not immediately join in the hunt since they were investigating an accident. In the course of investigating an accident, they went to the Marksville Hospital

(R. pp. 775 and 776). While at the hospital they were approached by two boys who advised them that several of the persons involved in the killing had been apprehended at the Ranch House Motel; however, one of the boys involved was still in the motel room (R. pp. 777 and 778). The troopers proceeded then to the motel and found the defendant Hopper in the room. The following is the conversation between Hopper and the officers:

"Q. Now, what Mr. Lemoine, did you first say to him? Who spoke first when you got in, you or him?

"A. I don't recall. I do remember asking him if he was one of the subjects involved in the incident at the Pelican Club, referring to a fight. You want me to proceed, sir?

"Q. Yes.

"A. He did answer he was one of them. I asked him if there was anyone else in the room with him. He said, no, there was not and I then told him that he was under arrest and I would carry him over to the courthouse.

"Q. Did you at that time tell him what he was arrested for?

"A. I told him that the city officers and parish officers wanted him for murder." (R. p. 781)

After the arrest of Hopper, he was taken by the officers to the Sheriff's Office, turned over to the local law enforcement officials and the State Police officers went off duty. This narrative of the events surrounding the arrest was corroborated by Trooper Eddie Bordelon (R. pp. 801-809).

From a review of the cases cited by petitioners, as well as those of *State v. Green*, 150 So.2d 571, 244 La. 80; *State v. Marchetti*, 173 So.2d 531, 247 La. 649; it is evident that the arresting officers are placed in the position of "the reasonable man", taking into consideration the probabilities and practical considerations of every day life on which reasonable men could reasonably be expected to act. *Brinegar v. U.S.*, 338 U.S. 160; *State v. Bourg*, 248 La. 844, 182 So.2d 510 (1966); *State v. Johnson*, 249 La. 950, 192 So.2d 135 (1966).

The State is firmly convinced that under the facts and circumstances set forth, any officer would have proceeded to make the arrest, certain that a felony had been committed and that the defendants were involved in the commission thereof. In view of the above the arrest certainly was not an illegal one. Comprehensive review of this issue was made by the Supreme Court of Louisiana which found no basis for petitioners complaint of illegal arrests. See Application, A-14—20.

B. Petitioners next allege that they were denied their statutory and constitutional rights regarding the legality of their detention, regarding an effective warning about their right to have and secure counsel, and their right to remain silent.

Once again, the facts proved and of record, simply do not support petitioners' position. The record shows that Chief Dubea and Sgt. Lemoine made clear to petitioners that they were under arrest for murder.

See quoted material in part "A", *supra*. The petitioners were booked within twelve hours of their arrest. They were indicted by the grand jury almost within a month of the homicide and thereafter ordered held without bail. "Their confinement was therefore at all times legal confinement". Supreme Court of Louisiana, Application A-31.

Petitioners' suggestion that Louisiana has adopted the McNabb-Mallory rule is nothing short of preposterous. The only case cited for such a proposition is *State v. Davidson*, 248 La. 161, 177 So. 2d 273 (1965). That case held that, there then being no statutory procedural vehicle for raising the issue of illegally obtained evidence (*Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U. S. 643 (1961), Louisiana would follow the Federal procedural precedent of a pre-trial motion to suppress, unless surprise or lack of opportunity were present. *Davidson* had nothing to do with the legality of a detention. However, the recent case of *State v. Johnson*, 249 La. 950, 192 So. 2d 135 (1966) did. It should also be noted that *Johnson* cited with approval *State v. Marchetti*, 247 La. 649, 173 So. 2d 531 (1965) which rejected the proposition that the *McNabb* rule was Louisiana's law or was required of Louisiana's law.

Prior to any interrogation of the petitioners in the instant case, it was made clear to each of them that they had a right to counsel, that they had a right to *call* counsel, and that they had a right to remain silent, but that, if they did make any statements, such could be used against them. See the pertinent testi-

mony set out in Application, A-21-28. As summarized by the Supreme Court of Louisiana at Application A-31, there is no evidence that either petitioner, before or after the warning, requested counsel or the right to secure counsel. There is no evidence that they had counsel present during the interrogation who was not allowed to serve them. There was no showing that the petitioners requested to use the telephone nor that they were refused its use. See Application A-31.

It is respectfully submitted that the Louisiana Supreme Court properly applied the holdings of *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964); *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U. S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966); and *Johnson v. State of New Jersey*, 384 U. S. 719, 86 S.Ct. 1772 (1966). Although it is respectfully submitted that the facts of the instant case would stand the test of *Miranda*, under the *Johnson* holding, only the test of *Escobedo* must be met and it was clearly met. This case was tried in June of 1965. *Johnson* made it clear that *Miranda* applies only to cases beginning after June 20, 1966. At 384 U.S. 721, the Court stated:

> "In this case we are called upon to determine whether *Escobedo v. State of Illinois* . . . and *Miranda v. State of Arizona* . . . should be applied retroactively. We hold that *Escobedo* affects only those cases in which the trial began after June 22, 1964, the date of that decision. We hold further that *Miranda* applies only to cases in which the trial began after the date of our decision one week ago." (References omitted)

The reasons for this ruling are amply detailed

in the Court's opinion, the primary reason being to effect the orderly administration of justice:

> "At the same time, retroactive application of *Escbedo* and *Miranda* would seriously disrupt the administration of our criminal laws. It would require the retrial or release of numerous prisoners found guilty by trustworthy evidence in conformity with previously announced constitutional safeguards. . . . 384 U.S. 731."

The Louisiana Supreme Court reviewed in detail the facts surrounding the confessions or admissions of the petitioners and found nothing to support their present contention that the confessions were involuntary. Application A-20-32. Neither petitioner was questioned extensively. Neither was mistreated. Neither was in a state which precluded a voluntary statement. Both were calm and coherent. Both were wholly advised as to their legal rights to remain silent and to all of their other rights, discussed above. Both were of at least average intelligence and were students in college. Both elected to make statements. It is respectfully submitted that these statements were perfectly proper and unquestionably admissible in evidence.

Petitioners' exhaustive research and citation of numerous cases cannot cure the basic defect in their position: the facts simply are not as they allege.

Response to Petitioners' Part V. Comulative Error

As the first of the alleged comulative errors, petitioners argue that the admission in evidence of color slides of the autopsy made by one Dr. John B.

Maxwell, the pathologist who made the autopsy, was prejudicial to the right of the defendants to receive a fair trial and listed eight exceptions as indicated on page 83 of petitioners' brief.

Generally speaking, the objection is based on the fact that the defense stipulated that Ralph Beeson, the decedent, died from trauma to the brain incidental to a basal fracture of the skull; that the color slides were gruesome and offered probative value but all to only prejudice the jury.

In support of petitioners' contention citing *State v. Morris*, 245 La. 175, 157 So. 2d 728 (1963) and *State v. Morgan*, 211 La. 572, 30 So. 2d 434 (1947), it is submitted that the test regarding the admissibility of photographs of a victim is as stated in *State v. Hamilton*, 249 La. 392, 187 So. 2d 417 (1966), at page 421.

> "The fact that objects or photographs constitute or portray a repulsive spectacle and tend to prejudice the jury furnishes no valid ground for their exclusion where they are otherwise relevant. *State v. Ross*, 217 La. 837, 47 So. 2d 559 (1950); *State v. Morgan*, 211 La. 572, 30 So. 2d 434 (1957). Such evidence is admissible if offered to furnish a description of the wound or to shed light on any issue. *State v. Eubanks*, 240 La. 552, 124 So. 2d 543 (1960); 2 Wharton, Criminal Evidence, Sec. 686 (12th ed. 1955)".

In the *Morris* case, the photographs were ruled inadmissible for reasons not present in the instant case. The Court there found their relevancy overwhelmed by their gruesomeness. There, the defen-

dant had been convicted of murder for the shooting of his victim and that certain of the pictures introduced unnecessarily showed the coroner holding various organs inside the bloody incision of the victim at autopsy; the only issue was whether the defendant had killed intentionally or in the heat of passion.

Unlike the *Morris* case, the instant case involves a killing by beating where the State had the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants specifically intended to inflict serious bodily harm upon the decedent victim. L.R.S. 14:30. The color slides were clearly relevant to that issue so that the jury might properly assess the intent from the severity of the wounds. The then applicable L.R.S. 15:441 defined relevant evidence as that which tends to show ". . . the commission of the offense and the intent . . .". Further, L.R.S. 15:445 provided that the intent ". . . may be inferred from the circumstances of the transaction". No such fact was at issue in the *Morris* case where an inherently lethal weapon, a gun, was the instrument of the killing.

Further, the mere stipulations by defense counsel that the decedent victim died by trauma to the brain and that decedent died by reason or causes related by Dr. Maxwell in response to his questioning, in no way renders the slides irrelevant. Such stipulations fall short of giving the jury an adequate idea of the number and severity of the wounds and the intent of the defendants to inflict serious bodily harm.

In the *Morgan* case, the only reasons advanced

for admitting gruesome photographs of the decedent victim, where the instrument of the killing was a shotgun, was to prove the corpus delicti, and to show the nature, scope and extent of the wounds. It is submitted there could have been no doubt as to the intent to inflict great bodily harm where a shotgun is used, unlike the instant case where the victim died by a beating and where the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the specific intent to inflict great bodily harm.

It should be noted that the trial judge allowed a full argument on the admissibility of the slides outside of the hearing of the jury and viewed the slides himself prior to ruling on their admissibility.

It is further submitted that the admissibility vel non of such pictures or slides rests in the sound discretion of the Trial Judge. *State v. Fulghum*, 242 La. 767, 138 So. 2d 569 (1962), app. dism. 371 U.S. 5 (1962).

Petitioners object to the fact that a jury view of a truck and a jury view of the cell block, heretofore referred to in our brief, out of the presence of defendants, was prejudicial to the defendants and that the right of the defendants to be present at the viewing could not be waived expressly or impliedly by defendants' counsel.

It is noted in the opinion of the Supreme Court that the viewing of the truck and the cell block was at the request of defendants' counsel (Application

A-70—A-72). On two occasions the Louisiana Supreme Court in its opinion quotes defense counsel's statements to the effect that the truck was brought next to the Courthouse for the purpose of the jury seeing it. In response to the request by counsel for the defendants, the Court called counsel to the bench to discuss the conditions for the viewing by the jury. The defendants did not ask that they be present during the viewing by the jury. The Trial Judge specifically states that the defendants and other spectators looked through the windows of the Courtroom and watched the examination of the truck on the parking lot down stairs. As to the jail cells, the Louisiana Supreme Court noted that the defendants were present when all testimony was induced relative thereto, and that the defendants themselves occupied the cell on April 20, 1964.

The per curiam by the Trial Judge relative to the jury viewing is quoted in full as follows (Application A-75);

> "This bill refers to the jury viewing the truck offered in evidence and a certain jail cell in the Parish Jail, without being accompanied by the defendants. No objection was made at the time; counsel for defendants waived their clients' presence. Counsel for defendants wanted the jury to go see the truck parked outside the Courthouse, on the Courthouse parking lot. The Courtroom is on the third floor. The Court called a conference of the District Attorney and counsel for defendants. I stated that if we could agree on when

this would be done and who was to go with the jury, I would arrange a visit to the truck, on the parking lot, by the jury. The attorneys for both sides were called up to my desk. It was agreed that just before the noon recess, the jury, the attorneys for both sides, the Court, the Clerk of Court and the deputies in charge of the jury would walk down the stairs and view the truck. It was further agreed that all others, spectators, etc., would be removed from the area; that there was to be no talking or questions asked about the case or about the truck. That after viewing the truck in this manner, the jury would be released to the Sheriff's custody for their noon day meal, without returning to the Courtroom. It is the Court's recollection *that the defendants* and other spectators *looked through the windows of the Courtroom to watch the examination of the truck on the parking lot downstairs.*

"As for the jail cell, the same procedure was followed. Attorneys for both sides were called to the bench and agreed to let the jury go upstairs (4th floor) from the 3rd floor, without the defendants accompanying them, but with the attorneys, the Court, the deputies in charge and the clerk. They were to march or walk up a stairway and there was to be no questioning or testimonh of any kind during the visit.

"On both occasions, Court was recessed for the purpose and on both occasions the procedure was agreed to by the attorney for the defendants and the District Attorney and never was there any objection to the procedure by anyone. The matter was raised for the first time in the Motion for a New Trial.

"REASON: We were operating in crowed quarters. The Court wanted to keep the jury separate and apart from the defendants and the courtroom spectators. The narrow stairways, crowded jail, etc., would have made it impossible to separate the jury from the defendants. All the sheriff's force, except two deputies were under the rule as witnesses in the case and this was the only way the visits could be arranged. The problems involved were pointed out to the attorneys by the Court, at the bench, privately, before the viewing visits, and all agreed as proposed, beforehand, and without objection." (Emphasis ours)

The Louisiana Supreme Court, in its opinion (Application A-74-75) noted the cases, *State v. Furtrell*, 159 La. 1093, 106 So. 651; *State v. Pepper*, 189 La. 795, 180 So. 640; and *State v. Breedlove*, 199 La. 965, 7 So. 21 221 cited by petitioners and concluded:

"Since the appearance of the jail cell and its viewing had to do with the credibility of the witnessess as to their recollection of the cells physical conditions, we find that defendants were not prejudiced by not being present at the inspection. The viewing of the cell had nothing to do with examining the scene of the commission of the crime or with evidence associated with the commission thereof. We conclude that the presence of the defendants was not necessary and the rule that one who is tried for a felony must be personally present in Court at every important stage of the trial from the moment of his ar-

raignment to his sentence was not violated herein."

Petitioners admit on p. 30 and p. 90 of their brief that ordinarily the failure of the defendants to be present at the two views by the jury might be of no significance except for the fact of the remarks by the District Attorney in his closing-rebuttal argument which heretofore has been referred to on p. ..... of our brief.

Immediately upon objection by defense counsel, the trial judge instructed the jury as follows (Application A-68):

> "You gentlemen of the jury will disregard that statement as to pictures you did not see. Any evidence that was excluded during the process of this trial are not to be considered by you in any manner, shape or form and the statement of the District Attorney is (inaudible)—they are to be disregarded by you. The Court will deny of course, the motion for a mistrial in view of this statement to disregard."

The Louisiana Supreme Court in its opinion (Application A-68) notes that:

> "The general rule is that instruction of the Court at the proper time nullifies the prejudicial effect of the improper statement made by tne prosecuting officer during the course of the trial." Citing *State v. Dowdy*, 217 La. 773, 47 So. 2d 497.

Petitioners in conclusion argue that the "totality of the circumstances" warrant the imposition by this

Honorable Court of the McNabb-Mallory rule, petitioners avering:

> "The Courts' below never determined upon the evidence as a whole and its entirety that the defendants had a fair trial but rather they determined or concluded that as to each error the Courts did not find prejudice to the defendants." (Application p. 91).

It is submitted in conclusion that it is inconceivable indeed to proceed through a trial of many weeks duration as in the instant case, where certain errors made by both counsel for prosecution and counsel for the defendants would not have to be corrected by the Trial Court.

The Louisiana Supreme Court in its opinion (Application A-62) notes:

> "The jurisprudence is legion that generally instructions of the Trial Court at proper times nullify the prejudicial effect of an improper statement made by a prosecuting officer during the course of trial."
>
> Citing *State v. Dowdy*, 217 La. 773, 47 So. 2d 496; *State v. Brazile*, 234 La. 145, 99 So. 2d 62; *State v. Brossette*, 229 La. 420, 86 So. 2d 87; *State v. Jackson*, 227 La. 642, So. 2d 105.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing facts of record and in view of the foregoing precedents, it is respectfully submitted that the petitioners present no substantial federal question for the decision of this Court and that

the petition should be dismissed and the decree of the Supreme Court of Louisiana should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

JACK P. F. GREMILLION,
Attorney General for the
State of Louisiana.

WILLIAM P. SCHULER,
Second Asst. Attorney General.

HARRY H. HOWARD,
Assistant Attorney General.

LAWRENCE L. McNAMARA,
Special Counsel.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, William P. Schuler, a member of the Bar of the United States Supreme Court, do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing opposition to petition for writ of certiorari has been served on petitioners, John T. Hopper and Joe A. Woodard, by placing a copy of the same in the United States Mail this date, postage prepaid, and properly addressed to their counsel of record as follows:

Camile F. Gravel, Jr., Esquire
611 Murray Street
Alexandria, Louisiana 71301

New Orleans, Louisiana, this ..... day of ....., 1968.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1967.

HOOPER ET AL. *v.* LOUISIANA.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA.

No. 1291. Decided June 17, 1968.

PER CURIAM.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted and the judgment is vacated. The case is remanded to the Supreme Court of Louisiana for further consideration in light of *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U. S. —, and *Roberts* v. *Russell*, No. 920, Misc., decided June 10, 1968.

MR. JUSTICE BLACK dissents.

MR. JUSTICE HARLAN and MR. JUSTICE WHITE dissent for the reasons stated in MR. JUSTICE WHITE's dissenting opinion in *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U. S. —, — (1968).

CASE